

AMERICAN CHURCH REVIEW.

VOL. XXX²~~III~~.—NOVEMBER AND DECEMBER, 1880.

THE ORIGIN OF POLYTHEISM.

Until quite recently the Bible has been considered as the only source of knowledge concerning the very early history of man. And for this purpose it was regarded as inspired, and intended by its Divine Author to be received as a sober, literal, historic statement of events which occurred, in part at least, before man could have been an observer of them; and partly before his attainments in the arts of writing and preserving historic documents could be relied upon for information relating to events, some of which were of the greatest importance to us.

But recent investigations in several different lines, have not only thrown great light on this early period of our history, they have also raised the question whether the early part of the book of Genesis, if we are to continue to regard it as divinely inspired in any sense or to any extent, can be much longer accepted as historically true at all. The alternative seems to be to regard it rather in the light of a parable, intended to treat certain great *religious* truths,

such as the creation and moral government of the world by a One Supreme Being, and the consequent duty of obedience and religious worship, rather than to give any scientific or even historic account of the events.

However, it is not my intention to discuss in this article this question with regard to the historic character of the early part of the Book of Genesis. I aim rather to present some facts and theories that have been brought to our notice and suggested for our consideration by several of the different lines of investigation already referred to.

The *Theory* of Evolution has been much discussed and is pretty well understood, both in its specific teachings and its natural consequence upon the religious beliefs and habits of mankind. At present the current is setting very decidedly and strongly against the theory. Its advocates have encountered obstacles which, at present, there seems no way of either surmounting or evading; while the *discussion* of the theory and the amount of facts and considerations adduced in its favor are likely, and, as it seems to me, are certain to involve among us a habit of thinking much more than we have been accustomed to do of *God in nature*, and as working His purposes and plans by natural means, and to consider nature in fact as but a system of means which He devised and created for the very purpose of using them for the accomplishment of His designs in creating man—in Creation and in Salvation.

The lines of geological and palæontological investigation *first* compelled us to change our views of the chronology of creation and the length of time during which man has been an inhabitant of this earth. The length of time is by no means determined by this line of inquiry; and authorities differ in their claims—the difference ranging from eight or ten thousand years up to several millions.

But another view which has been *suggested* by the results obtained in the prosecution of this line has been that primitive man must have been very low in the scale of intelligence and very brutal in his habits—thus falling in with and giving aid to the Evolution theory.

To this suggestion two answers may be given. It has been said in answer, and truly, that no investigations thus far have disclosed to us any remains of man or his works in that part of the earth's surface where he first made his appearance. Hence, whatever we have thus found has been merely a means of throwing light on man as he was, far from his original home, and after many generations, which may quite possibly have been ages of decline and degeneration. To infer that there was not a very high civilization in Egypt or Mesopotamia when prehistoric man was living in caves in England, would be like inferring to-day that there is no high civilization in London and Paris now, because men are so degraded in New Holland and the Andaman Islands.

It is again urged, and with equal truth and force, that what has thus been found relating to early man is not the best and truest indication of what he really was, and what constitutes the real difference between man and brute—or, on the other hand, the resemblance between them, if indeed they were alike in any respect, and the extent of that resemblance. The true indication of what man is, is that which expresses his thoughts and feelings—his hopes and aspirations—the manifestations of his rational nature.

Hence the investigations in the line of history proper become of the utmost importance. These investigations have been carried on by the discovery and deciphering of ancient languages and monuments, and by the pursuit of the comparison of languages.

Much has been expected from this line of investigation, and more especially from the study of languages, in favor of the unity of mankind and their descent from one pair. Bunsen, Gesenius, Max Müller, Whitney, and a host of other scholars in this line, agree in thinking that whatever argumentative force there may be in the indications of the comparison of languages, is in favor of unity. Some of them, as Bunsen, think it very strong and well-nigh conclusive. Others, as Whitney, do not regard it as amounting to much.

But to my mind there is a very much stronger argument for the original historic unity of mankind to be derived from a comparison of their institutions. This branch of the subject has not yet been sufficiently elaborated to allow of its being presented so that we can judge of and exhibit its true force. I will, however, just mention one feature that will serve as an illustration.

Much has lately been said about the "Village Communities" among the early Aryan races. And it has been shown to have been common to them all, and to have been moreover the beginning of their civilization—their form of government and their systems of jurisprudence. Dr. Hearn's recent work, "*The Aryan Household*," is a perfect storehouse of argument and illustration on this point.

Now there can be little or no doubt that this institution, in so far as the organization of the family, and the tenure of of property are concerned, was the primitive condition of all the Shemitic races as well. Nearly everything in the organization and management of the family and the rights of property—including the "homestead exemption" of all real estate, among the Israelites, had its root in something almost precisely the same as the "Aryan Household." The original frame-work was the same, and the Hebrew family and tribes were but the Aryan Household and Close, modified by the influence of the Law as given by Moses.

And just now I have had the pleasure of an interview with one who has been forty years in China, and a careful student of all the institutions of China and the Mongol or Turanian races. And, on inquiry, I find there that the same idea and organization of the household was the starting point of their history and civilization—such as it has been. The idea of the Family, the tenure of the property, the idea of marriage, of *cognation* and *agnation*, what we find developed in Roman Law, and even the worship of the ancestors—and the belief in their presence, and as still the head—though invisible—of the Family.

A volume could be written on this subject. And I have

no doubt a volume will soon be written upon it, and show that in every branch of the human family, except a few of the very lowest, where savagery and degeneration have shown their worst and their most—some common institutions and views will be found sufficient to prove a common origin.

But I have a more specific object before me at present.

These investigations in the line of language and history have shown that man was at first an intelligent being—possessed of great simplicity of character and moral purity. The idea of a Family was then naturally enough somewhat different from what it is now. The father was regarded of course as the head of the family. And so too he continued to be after the second and even the third generation had been born into the household. And after his death the oldest son for the most part succeeded him, until he himself passed into the unseen world, but was nevertheless worshipped and believed to be still present in their religious observances.

This *family* religion could not have existed at the very first, and most likely had undergone a good deal of development before we find it in history. Nor was it, at the first stages of its usage, at all inconsistent with a belief in God as a Supreme Being.

The result of these inquiries may be stated without going into detail in the words of Keary (*Dawn of History*, p. 112), "They felt without being able to express it the Divine Cause which lay behind the object whose grandeur and beauty appealed to their wonder, and they loved and worshipped the Unseen, while viewing the seen only." Max Müller says (*Series of Language*, 2d Series, p. 443), "the more we go back, the more we examine the earliest germs of every religion, the purer I believe we shall find the conception of the Deity. . . . But the more we go back the more helpless also we shall find human language in its endeavor to express what, of all things, was most difficult to express." (p. 476) "It was one of the first articles in the

primitive faith of mankind that in one sense or another they had a Father in Heaven." They saw the dawn as the coming light—the symbol of the person of God. But as Müller says (p. 536), "Beyond the Dawn, however, another infinite Power was suspected, for which no language had yet suggested a name." Hearn (p. 285) says of this primitive worship, "There is philological evidence that the Aryans were a religious race. Their language contains an abundance of terms expressive of religious sentiment, of adoration, of piety, of faith, of prayer, and of sacrifice. . . . That language contains nothing that is suggestive of *public* worship. It knows nothing of priests or of idols—of temples or of altars."

Max Müller calls this early state one of "unconscious monotheism." He says (p. 445), "As soon as man becomes conscious of himself, as soon as he perceives himself as distinct from all other things and persons, he at the same moment becomes conscious of a Higher Self, a higher power without which he feels that neither he nor anything else would have any life or reality. . . . This is the first *sense* of the Godhead, the *sensus communis*, as it has been called; for it is a *sensus*—an immediate perception, not the result of reasoning or generalization, but an intuition, as irresistible as the impressions of our senses." "This primitive intuition of God, however," as he argues in another place (*Chips*, Vol. I, p. 384), "Was in itself neither monotheistic, nor polytheistic, though it might become either. It was this primitive intuition which supplies either the subject or the predicate in all the religions of the world, and without it no religion, whether true or false, whether revealed or natural, could have had even its first beginning. . . . In no language does the plural exist before the singular. No human mind could have conceived of the idea of gods without having previously conceived the idea of a god. . . . A belief in God as exclusively One involves a distinct negation of more than one, and that negation is possible only after the conception, whether real or imaginary, of many gods."

And we have found history everywhere confirming what is thus announced as theory and reasonable expectation. Everywhere do we find this sentiment—*ἡ κοινὴ τοῦ θεοῦ νόησις*—this “common sense or insight of God,” as Epicurus calls it (*Diog. Laer.* B x 123), prevailing before either polytheism, priesthood or idolatry had made its appearance. All men believed. All men worshipped, and nobody doubted the reality of the Unseen, though as yet Unnamed, object of worship, any more than they doubted the warmth and glow of the sun-light of day, or the darkness and gloom of night.

But for this Object of worship they had no name. They ascribed to Him all phenomena and all acts, as we say now “it rains,” “it snows.” But this unnamed It,—who or what was it? The reflecting intellect could not fail to ask the question. The Aryans said: It appears in the morning light. It shines in the heavens—drives away the clouds—gives us rain and fruitful seasons. The Shemites said: It is high—above all; it is mighty, and rules over all. The Turanians said: It is terrible. It protects and defends all. But who is it and what is its name? This was the question of the age. And history *now* shows us how they answered it.

Hearn, speaking of the Aryan nations more especially, says (p. 285), “Among the Hindu nations the names of their gods are simply the names of the various objects of nature, and were originally used with a full appreciation of their physical signification. All these objects had thus received their names before they became objects of adoration. There was a time, therefore, when the language was spoken but polytheism did not exist.

And this author goes on to state his belief that polytheism came in not as a *religious* development, properly so regarded, but rather as an effort—a first effort at *science*. This religious instinct or sentiment ascribed all things and all phenomena to God as “the Infinite Power beyond the dawn,” as Müller has it, or the Unseen that lay behind

the things that were seen and for which they had names," as Keary has it. And this Unseen, Unnamed SOMETHING, was regarded as the cause of all the phenomena and changes in nature—as well as the Object of religious adoration and worship.

This view is consistent with that which Max Müller has so ably developed in his now world-famous Essay on "*Comparative Mythology*," (Chips, Vol. II, pp. 1—161): His doctrine is in general terms that gradually the verbs and adjectives which had been used to ascribe to the unnamed It, the acts and blessings of which He was believed to be the cause and the source—became names, some of them concrete and others abstract. For "it dawns," we have the word "dawn;" from "it rains" the word "rain," etc. This name "dawn" has passed into all the Indo-European or Aryan languages as the name of the Most High God. It became the Greek *Theos*, the Latin *Deus*, and is the root of our word *Deity*.

It is certainly very likely that the names of all the gods of the Aryan polytheism originated in this way; as in fact Müller has shown in the Essay just referred to, and others of his, bound in the same volume. And if we take his theory and combine with it that of Hearn (and the two are in no ways inconsistent or incompatible) we have the following as a result:

Worshippers called God by as many names as they had words describing his acts and attributes. As we say now God is the Creator; He is Almighty; He is Eternal. And we also call Him "Providence," the "Sovereign Ruler," etc. Now in a religious point of view the Aryans had forgotten in many cases the early, primitive meanings of these words, just as we have forgotten the meaning of hundreds of the roots we use in our language. And as their primitive meaning passed out of the thoughts of men, they began to think that each separate name denoted a separate god, instead of (as was really the case) separate attributes and alternate conceptions of the One God. And for the

purposes of science they had also instead of one Cause or Force working everywhere, as many causes or forces as they had objects or classes of objects to contemplate. As religious men they had many gods to worship, and as scientists they had many causes to investigate—as many as in their religion they had of gods to worship, and, what was unfortunate in its consequences at least, both classes—the gods whom they worshipped and the causes whose operations they studied, were called by the same names.

"These names," which as Hearn says, "were at first used with a full appreciation of their physical signification," were as Müller says (*Chips*, Vol. II, p. 72), "Thrown out by language at the first burst of youthful poetry, and based on bold metaphors. These metaphors were forgotten, or the meaning of the roots whence the words were derived once dimmed or changed, many of the words would naturally lose their radical as well as their poetical meaning. They would become mere names, handed down in the conversation of a family, understood perhaps by the grandfather, familiar to the father, but strange to the son and misunderstood by the grandson." And thus would be invented a myth to ascribe a meaning to the *non*-understood or *mis*-understood term.

The myth of Endymion, which I will abridge from Müller, will best illustrate this point. He shows that the name comes from a forgotten Aryan root. "It is derived," he says, "from a verb which is never used in classical Greek, to denote the setting sun." Nevertheless they had the word and the myth of Endymion and Selene—really the setting sun and the moon. Endymion—the setting sun—was the son of Zeus and Kalyke—the sky. But because he sets in the west he was made son of Æthlios, a king of Elis—which was to the west of Attica—Æthlios himself also being called a son of Zeus. In the ancient poetical and proverbial language of Elis people said "Selene loves and watches Endymion," instead of it is getting late or the evening, with sunset and the rising of the moon is coming on; and

"Selene embraces Endymion," instead of the sun is setting and the moon rising; and Selene kisses Endymion into sleep, for "it is night." These expressions remained long after their meaning had ceased to be understood, and as the human mind is generally as anxious for a reason as it is ready to invent one, a story arose by common consent, revised, improved and embellished with constant repetition until we have the myth that represents Endymion as a young lad—most likely a prince, loved by the lady Selene; and if the children were anxious to know more about them there would always be a grandmother ready to tell how this young and beautiful Endymion was the son of Protagenia. She, half meaning and half not meaning by that name the dawn which gave birth to the sun or of Kalyke, the dark, all-covering night. . . . So that Endymion grew at last into a type, no longer of the setting sun, but of a beautiful boy beloved of a chaste maiden, and therefore most likely a young prince.

We have thus an illustration and a proof of the way in which Polytheism originated among the Aryan nations. It was in a certain sense as Müller calls it, "*A Disease of Language*." Words whose meaning had been forgotten were erected into names of gods; a worship was invented for them, and myths devised to serve as a prevailing and popular theology.

Among the Aryan nations the names that for the most part were developed into gods, had been derived from natural phenomena and events. Hence the peculiar character of their polytheism and mythology. Owing also to the peculiarities of their languages each nation or subdivision invented a polytheism of its own. Doubtless there were many names and elements common to them all. But each language had in itself the means and the tendency to develop a polytheism of its own, with the declining intelligence and the growing depravity of its people.

If now we turn to the Shemitic family we find a development of polytheism indeed—although the process was only in part the same.

The first stage was like the Aryan development, except that with the Aryans no *scientific* impulse, as it would appear, occurred. And hence these people developed their names for God rather from His moral attributes than from His acts and agency in nature, and amidst the physical phenomena of daily observation. Hence *Al* and *Elohim*, the High, the Mighty; *Baal*, the Ruler; *Moloch*, the King, etc. I omit from this list the name Jehovah as not coming within the range of the remarks I have to make with regard to the others.

But now we come to a most important difference between the Aryan and Shemitic races. The language of the latter possessed no such means for, and offered no such temptation to the development of a polytheism as the Aryan. It had but few roots, did not form compound words, and had none of that process of "phonetic decay" whereby the original roots or their signification became lost, while any word retaining the root at all continued in use. Put the word in any form you please and it would still show, to all those that used it, its radical meaning. They could not mistake a word which meant etymologically "the setting sun," for a princely youth; "the rising moon," for a beautiful, lovesick maiden. If the word meant primarily to rule, as a noun it meant "The Ruler"—and the Shemitic mind knew of but One.

But polytheism appeared among the Shemites also. It came about, however, in a way quite different from that which caused its spread among the Aryans. Among the latter, as we have seen, each race or tribe had a number of gods, the names of which had been developed among themselves. Among the Shemites, on the other hand, each tribe or family had but one name of its own. The Hebrews may have preferred *El* or *Alloah*, the Mighty; the Syrians, *Rimmon*, the High; the Ammonites *Moloch*, the King; the Tyrians *Bel* or *Baal*, the Ruler. But in theory no one of these peoples had two or more names for their own use—they each developed a name for themselves. And *their* form

of polytheism came *from* or rather *by* borrowing from one another.

The idea of a One God over all the earth had passed away in the growing degeneracy of the times, as it had among the Aryans also. But the Shemites were more social and kept up more of a friendly intercourse with one another than the Aryan races had done. And hence by sheer good nature—"liberality" I suppose we should call it in these modern days—each race or tribe or family would acknowledge the god of another to be about as good as their own, or at any rate a god to be worshipped. And this worship they would render by way of liberality or accommodation—perhaps sometimes even by way of ostentation—to the gods of other nations when they wished to be on good terms with them. In this way most of the Shemitic nations became polytheistic also.

But we come now to a *third* method in which in this downward progress a polytheism was developed.

We get the best illustration of this method in the history of Egypt. And here I wish to mention the publication of RENOUF'S Hibbert Lectures on "*The Origin and Growth of Religion, as illustrated by the Religion of Ancient Egypt.*"

The Egyptians were neither Aryans nor Shemites—this is abundantly shown in various ways. They came into the valley of the Nile from the Northeast, at a date long before the time of Abraham. They were monotheists when they reached Egypt, and many of the principles of their early religion might have been found in our Bible, without any disparagement to its character or any feeling of surprise as at the incongruity. It is most likely that at this early period in their history they had no recognized and generally accepted name for the object of their worship. They had called It or Him "Terrible," "Protector," "Defender," etc. They evidently had not seen a crocodile. But when they saw one they called him "terrible." They had considered the habits of the bull as the protector of the herd, and they called him "protector" and "defender" also.

Now, instead of making an abstract noun out of these adjectives, as the Aryans did for the most part, or making a noun for the bringing out of the attributes, as the Shemites did, they took the object itself—the crocodile and the bull each respectively for their gods. Thus, while an Aryan would have worshipped Terribleness, and the Shemites “the Terrible,” the Egyptians worshipped the crocodile because he was terrible—the bull because he was “the defender” of the herd; the scarabæus because (as a scavenger) he was “the promoter of health,” etc.

There is undoubtedly another form of polytheism—a polytheism that has arisen in another way—that prevails to some extent among the savage nations of to-day; a method which has added perhaps something to each of the other kinds. I refer to the deification of men. Ancestor worship, as I have said, prevailed in the earlier stages of society among nearly all the larger families of mankind—though we see less of it among the Shemites than elsewhere.

Among the North American Indians there seems to be something of the kind. It is supposed that the tribes take their names from some ancestor, and in many cases they have come to worship that ancestor by the name which they bear, as their *totem*. Thus, suppose a powerful chief to have a name which in English we should call “beaver.” His children would of course be descendants of “Beaver.” But beaver is also the name of an animal that is very common to their experience. To designate the tribe they would very likely inscribe a beaver—a picture of the animal on whatever they wished to designate as characteristic of the tribe. And in course of time the tribe might come to believe that they had descended from or “developed” up out of—beavers, instead of being descended from a man by the name of Beaver. Then, very likely, after paying the accustomed homage to the Eponym—Mr. Beaver—they would degenerate into an idolatrous worship of beavers. It is likely, however, that for the most part the original name was rather a nick-name or an epithet than the real name of the founder of the tribe.

As yet no final classification of the varieties of man has been made. Of one distinct group, the Aryans, we have pretty full knowledge. And Hearn is not at all too confident when he says (p. 278), "A distinguished writer on Physical Science remarks that Shakespeare and Newton were descendants of savages. Whether in fact they were so or not, I do not pretend either to assert or to deny. But I venture to allege that so far as any trustworthy evidence on the subject is at present known to exist, savages were not the acknowledged progenitors of these great men. The ultimate fact, in the present state of knowledge upon this subject, is the condition of the Aryans. . . . It may be positively asserted that the men who spoke that language and possessed those institutions, were not, in any reasonable sense of the term, savages. It is by the aid of Comparative Philology that we are enabled to form some definite conception of the natural condition of our archaic forefathers. There is nothing in the conclusions of that science to suggest the low moral state—the wandering and precarious existence, the berries and the acorns of the noble savage."

And Renouf (p. 130) has a remark on this general subject that is well worth quoting: "The habits of savages without a history are not in themselves evidence which can, in any way, be depended upon. To take for granted that what the savages now are, perhaps after millenniums of degradation, all other people must have been, and that modes of thought through which they are now passing have been passed through by others, is a most unscientific assumption; and you will seldom meet with it in any essay or book without finding also proof that the writer did not know how to deal with historical evidence. Authorities are sure to be quoted which the historian knows to be worthless, and evidence in itself irreproachable will be completely misunderstood."

Even Herbert Spencer admits that history cannot be understood without the admission that among the savage races there has been a retrogression and degradation towards the

condition, habits and instincts of beasts. He says (*Principles of Sociology*, chap. vii.), "Direct evidence forces this conclusion upon us. Lapse from higher civilization to lower civilization, made familiar during our school-days, is further exemplified as our knowledge widens. . . . In Java there existed in the past a more developed society than exists now, and the like is shown in Cambodia. . . . Unquestionably causes like those which produced these retrogressions, have been at work during the whole period of human existence."

Now undoubtedly we know the early condition and the history of the Aryan group of families, including the Hindus, the Persians, the Greeks, the Romans, the Celts, the Teutons and the Slave, better than any other. But we know also pretty well with regard to the Shemitic group—their subdivisions, geographical distribution and their early condition. Beyond this our way is less clear and our means of knowledge is less complete. Of the Egyptians we know most. Of the Chinese knowledge is rapidly on the increase. And recent explorations in the Mesopotamian valley show that among the earliest settlers, perhaps the very earliest, were the Accad—who belonged to the Turanian group. They were the first settlers there; they built cities; they introduced the method of writing by cuneiform letters, and they seem to have been the founders of that early civilization. And in all these cases all we know and what we know conforms to the general theory presented above and confirms it. The first condition of all these people, and everywhere, was a devout, unreasoning monotheism, great purity of morals, simplicity of life and patriarchal form of government, with the early idea of the household and communal property.

But we do not know, and at present we seem to have no means or hope of knowing so well what were the precise limits and the subdivisions of the Turanian Family. And besides these there remains the Negro group, and the question as yet unsettled and possibly never to be settled, concerning the affinities of the native American tribes. Our

inductions from the other races whose history and early condition *we do know*, must be extended with cautious reserve to them. If they are mere degradation—specimens of the result of a development and evolution *downwards*, the fact is impressive and instructive, and is worthy, moreover, of a more careful study, and of an investigation in the new light which these results throw upon the problem.

But it is worth something—much, as I think—to know, with regard to all the civilized races and nations—that they began existence in a state of moral purity and religious faith, from which they degenerated until the two great events of the world's history—the covenant with Abraham among the Shemites, and the spread of Christianity among the Aryans—these Divine interpositions occurred to arrest this downward progress.

And here, too, it is worth noticing that the Divine method was not the one of modern scientists. God did not undertake to regenerate and recover the race by mere intellectual culture. He did not begin by teaching them arithmetic and the sciences. He laid the foundation deeper. He rested His work on a belief in the Oneness and the Onliness of God as the corner-stone. He began the work of erecting the edifice of the new Humanity—the new creation—by *moral and spiritual* regeneration through faith and obedience. And he trusted—as in His Providence and by the inworking of His Holy Spirit it has come about—that the sciences and a knowledge of them would come in due time, if men would only begin in the right way. First moral purity, and for this Faith and Obedience. Then mental culture and the prosecution of the sciences, with the application of them to the amelioration of the human condition.

I think it is worth something, too—worth a good deal, as I think—to know how this degradation and degeneracy came about. It throws much light upon the wisdom of the means which God has introduced and devised for the recovery. We see and can fully understand in this way that nothing less radical and thorough-going could have or give any reasonable hope of success.

W. D. WILSON.

THE MORAVIANS.

In the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, Moravia, a province of Austria, was with Bohemia, one of the chief homes of the Moravians; and, in the eighteenth century, some Moravians, who had fled to Saxony, revived their persecuted Society. Hence, although the historic Moravian Church dates several centuries earlier still, because it fell gradually under Romish influence, somewhat as the Church in England had also done, though, like England, always protesting and resisting, the *Unitas Fratrum* acquired the popular name of "Moravians."

Towards the middle of the ninth century, Bohemia and Moravia were converted by the efforts of the Greek Church and the preaching of Methodius and Cyril. These two missionaries translated the Scriptures and introduced a Liturgy. The pretensions of Rome becoming insupportable, John Huss, born in 1369, protested; was summoned before the Council of Constance; the pledge of personal safety broken, and his body burned at the stake, July 6, 1415.

On the estate of Lititz, one hundred miles or so from Prague, on the confines of Silesia, some of the adherents of Huss, in 1457 or thereabouts, took measures for the organization of what we may call Moravianism. Our Moravian friends claim that they are, thus, older than we as a Reformed Body; but they err in dating our Reformation from the days of Henry and his contemporaries; they should date it from the pioneer Wycliffe, a hundred and fifty years before Henry.

Three principles were agreed on: the Bible was to be the only source of Christian teaching; worship was to be scriptural and after Apostolic order; and the Lord's supper to

be doctrinally defined in the express words of Scripture, all human language to be rigidly excluded—this last a precaution which, if it had been followed by all Christians, would have spared the world a flood of words and bitterness.

The little handful at Lititz soon became a considerable number. The first clergy were those only who withdrew from the National Church; but, in 1467, Stephen and another "Bishop" of the Austrian Waldenses, consecrated Bradæius and two other Moravians, one a Roman Catholic and the other a Waldensian, to be "Bishops."

From a friend who is, I think, the grandson of one Moravian Bishop, and the nephew-in-law of a couple of others, and who was brought up among these gentle minded people, I, years ago, acquired not only a respect for the Moravian character, but became biased in favor of the fact of their possessing a valid Episcopate. My views, however, have become changed, and for one I cannot agree with the Bishop of Ohio that they possess it, although not infrequently in the South, Moravian clergy have officiated in our pulpits; among other instances is that of a distinguished Moravian "Bishop" in the pulpit of Trinity Church, Washington, during the rectorship of the Rev. Horace Stringfellow. The late Bishop of Maryland investigated the subject of the validity of the Moravian Episcopate with that thorough and accurate care for which his painstaking scholarship was so widely and so justly distinguished, and came, some thirty odd years ago, to a conclusion unfavorable to the Moravian claims. A point, too, which struck me as almost fatal, if not quite so, to the claims of our Moravian brethren, is that, although in friendly and constant correspondence with the Moravians of their day, neither Calvin nor Luther, who were certainly, being contemporary with the Moravian movement, competent to judge of the matter, ever solicited ordination at the hands of the Moravian Episcopate. Calvin wrote the celebrated suppressed letter to the English Bishops, asking to be consecrated a Bishop by them; Luther could defend his dispensing with the Episcopate on the sole

ground of *necessity*. Now, if there had been, in their estimation, the valid Episcopate near at hand among a people with whom they were on the most friendly terms, the one surely would not have applied to England, nor the other have had to plead necessity. It may be said that this only shows what Luther and Calvin thought of the Episcopate of the Moravians; and that the Episcopate may have been valid, for neither Luther nor Calvin was infallible. That is true; but while it shows only the opinions of Luther and Calvin, we must not forget that they were both in position to have opinions worth treating with respect, for they were contemporaries and correspondents.

It seems to me almost fatal to the Moravian claims that these men ignored them. Luther, a priest, and Calvin, a layman, each "founded a church." Each claimed necessity as the excuse for non-Episcopal organization. The latter even wrote an intercepted letter to England, begging consecration. Yet there, in a respectable Church, near at hand, already more than half a century old, and with which they were in free and friendly correspondence, there, accessible on request, was the validity of which they admitted themselves in need, and the great importance of which they confessed! That the Moravian Episcopacy would have been conferred upon the Lutheran and Calvinistic bodies, we may reasonably presume. I have written to a distinguished Moravian authority, inquiring what record (if any) there is, of its being sought, or offered; and shall await a reply with some anxiety.

The fourth persecution of the godly Moravian Christians—almost Quaker-like in their simple habits and tastes—was in 1547. This led to the establishment of the Polish Moravians, and the setting off of Poland as a Moravian Province. Here now we have a very simple "Provincial System" among the "Brethren," the three Provinces being Bohemia, Moravia, Poland. Schools, colleges, seminaries, printing houses, now sprung up. In 1609, the Moravians became legally recognized, by the promulgation of a State Enactment of Religious Liberty

A cloud now crosses the sky. The terrible "Thirty years War" breaks out. At White Mountain, the Bohemians are defeated. And (1620) the Emperor Ferdinand Second, the "Anti-reformer" completely changed the fortunes of the Moravians. From 1627 on, they were nearly eradicated. Only a few—"the Hidden Seed"—remained; the rest were scattered abroad in exile, or had died during the wars.

The Polish Province now became the field of Moravian labor. Here many had fled. At Lissa, in Poland; and also at places in Hungary, parishes were organized, congregations gathered, and orders preserved. Unfortunately, by the Peace of Westphalia, Bohemia and Moravia were not embraced in the arms of the religious liberty extended to other places; and in 1656 poor, devoted Lissa was burned to the ground in a war between Sweden and Poland. So, here, all the three "Provinces" of the Moravians were in an almost extinct state. For fifty years and more the Church had no visible existence—save in a way which shows the store set upon the so-called Episcopacy, and the care taken to preserve and perpetuate it. The "Hidden Seed" requires some explanation. It was in this "Hidden Seed" that the Moravian Episcopate survived. To preserve the gift of the Episcopate, the surviving Moravian Bishops privately consecrated clergy of the other Reformed Churches. In Bohemia and Moravia the "Hidden Seed" was Bishop Amos Comenius. He reprinted the history, the confession and the discipline of the seemingly expiring Church, referred his fellow-members to the Reformed English Church, and gave the Episcopate to some of the Reformed Clergy, that it might not expire. These conferred it on others; and so the "Hidden Seed" was sowed and gathered, and sowed and garnered again, and so preserved.

In 1707 Jæschke died, and like the ancient patriarchs, called together and amid the solemnities of his death-bed blessed his sons and prophesied better days for the Church of his fathers. Two of his son's sons, some years afterwards, surnamed Neisser, with David, passed over to Saxony. In

1722 they started the hamlet of Herrnhut, on the large property of Count Zinzendorf. This nobleman had offered them a secure home and religious freedom. His name is revered among Moravians to this day—as justly it should be. Soon hundreds and thousands flocked to Herrnhut, as English Puritans had to Holland, and afterwards to America; not, however, to prove their love of religious liberty by persecuting others, but, to their eternal honor be it said, by showing forth their love of Christ by their love of mankind! Never has blood stained their hands; and to no Christian Body may we look with greater pleasure for missionary zeal.

To Herrnhut the Moravians brought the books of Bishop Comenius, his godly discipline, very simple yet quite Churchly ritual; and in 1735 Jablonsky (the later) and Sitkovius, the two aged survivors of the Episcopate conferred by Comenius in 1699 and 1731, consecrated Nitschman; and in 1738 Nitschman and Jablonsky, with the consent of Sitkovius, consecrated Nicholas Louis (Count Zinzendorf, as he was also known, being a noble); and so the "Hidden Seed"—concealed for these whole generations—came to light and need now no longer be sowed in secrecy.

The history of Count Zinzendorf alone would fill this number. He propagated the Church as a series of colonies. He wished to avoid clashing with the State Church in which he had been reared. And thus settlements of his people soon found their way to America, England and the Continent. These were highly moral, and gained universal respect. Quakers and Moravians are to-day synonyms of simple life and Gospel morality. Diocesan boundaries were unknown to the Church. The "Bishop" was a kind of father; the congregations his children.

Among the chief works of the Moravians are boarding-schools, missions to the heathen, and the celebrated Diaspora Mission. This last is for the benefit of the members of the European churches, without requiring any to relinquish membership where they already hold it; some 80,000 or

90,000 have already been reached in this way, and still remain members where they were before.

In Germany the original system, with a modification, continues, and also in a few places in Great Britain. In our own country the original peculiarities of the Moravians were mostly, if not wholly, set aside in 1856.

In 1857, by a General Synod held at Herrnhut, the system was overhauled. There are now three Provinces—the English, the German and the American. Uniformity exists as to ritual, doctrine and discipline. Besides the Provinces is the Bohemian Mission and Foreign missionary work. It has boarding schools at Nazareth, Bethlehem, Litiz, Pa.; Hope, Indiana; and at Salem, N. C. Every Province meets in Synod triennially; and the General Church in General Synod every twelve years. Between Synods a Provincial Board acts for the Province. Bishops and elected clergy attend the Synods; I cannot learn that there is any lay representation. The General Synod also elects a Board. This between the meetings of the General Synod, superintends the mission work. The machinery is simple and effective.

The Moravians claim some 30,000 or 40,000 only, about 15,000 of whom are here; in the foreign field they claim some 75,000 converts; they have 400 or 500 missionaries at work. These figures approximate only.

It is gratifying for some things that attention is turned to our Moravian brethren. To no source can we look for a more practical exhibition of morality and religion combined; to none, for that of the love of Christ proved—not professed merely—but demonstrated in lives and work—by a love for God's children, wherever found, and by whatever name they may be named.

In character, the Moravian cultivates simplicity, sedateness and genuineness. The follies of life are severely frowned on. Worldly excesses are denounced by the elder, and are not allowed the young. The highest type of moral excellence is aimed at, and the summit of spiritual life ever

kept in view—Christ's example, the pattern for all things. Though the rigor of their system, like that of the Quakers, has tended to keep the church restricted in point of numerical strength, it has never been departed from. Children are brought up with care and in the nurture of the Lord. Strict surveillance is kept over childhood. Business integrity is inculcated; and the rash speculations of other business Christians, speculations often of the most questionable character, are unknown. To live within, not beyond, the income, is a rule of life. Strict church discipline, when needed, is enforced, and as far as can be without fear or favor.

The Moravians have a Liturgy, in which is a Litany of a very solemn nature; although they advocate and use pre-composed prayer, they allow free, extempore prayer to a certain extent. They have the festivals of the Church year, very much after our own order. They have the rite of Confirmation and receive members of other evangelical bodies on certificate; their doctrines are, in their cardinal points, the same as those of other evangelical Christians. As I have said, discipline is no rope of sand. There also exists among the Moravians what is, I think, called a Conversation or Interview; to which, for counsel, the "opening of grief" and comfort or instruction, the communicants go to the parish clergyman before occasions of the Holy Communion. On Easter morning the entire parish repairs to the burying ground, where high and low are buried alike (and where I think I have heard no tombstones are allowed), and chant solemn Easter hymns and other suitable music.

I cannot close without a repeated commendation of the exalted wisdom of the Moravians in not defining the doctrine of the Holy Communion *in any human words*. De Koven and Zwingle, Lutheran and Romanist, Methodist and Calvinist, might all learn a lesson from these simple Brethren, and leave the mysteries of Scripture clothed in the language of Scripture. God bless our Moravian Brethren for *all* they have that is lovely and of good report.

R. W. LOWRIE,

THE REVIVED MATERIALISM.¹

The second of the works named below contains some of the noblest vindications of the sovereignty of God that we remember to have seen. But the title of the book and what is intended to be its main argument, are very inopportune and detract seriously from the value of that which is so good and timely. The excellent author has fallen into the same mistake, which vitiates the speculations, of the atheistic scientists against whom the book is written. With them he seems to consider Law as something aside from the Will of the Creator. On the contrary, philosophy and religion alike assure us that "the reign of God is the reign of Law," and that "the reign of Law" is, of necessity, the reign of God. If the excellent author would gather up his thoughts upon "the reign of God" unencumbered with this fatal mistake, the work would be a valuable help to all of us.

Mr. Bacon's book is injured by one grave mistake. Mr. Hæckel's work may be described as a collection of mistakes and confusions in two volumes. While reading the book I was at a loss to account for its popularity with English students, when a solution of the puzzle occurred to me. A witty friend says that if you take clear water and stir in mud until you can see nothing in or through the water, that is German philosophy. Most English readers contemplated this

¹THE HISTORY OF CREATION: or the Development of the Earth and its Inhabitants; by the action of Natural Causes. A Popular Exposition of the Doctrine of Evolution in General, and of that of Darwin, Gœthe and Lamarck in particular. From the German of ERNST HÆCKEL, Professor in the University of Jena. In two volumes. NEW YORK: D. APPLETON & CO.

THE REIGN OF GOD NOT THE REIGN OF LAW. A new way (and yet very old) to decide the debate between "Science" and Religious Faith. By Thomas Scott Bacon. BALTIMORE: TURNBULL BROTHERS.

philosophy at a respectful distance with a sort of awed admiration. Kant, Fichte, Schelling and Hegel were almost mythical, and their conclusions must be taken at third or fourth hand. Not so with Hæckel. He is clear, perspicuous and simple. And our explanation of his popularity is that English readers are so happy to have found a real German philosopher whom they can understand! But such a labored mass of pretension and of inconsequence we have seldom seen. We have gone through these volumes, with some skipping, demanded by so large a collection of the commonplaces of natural history, with nothing original but the persistent perversion and the ever-recurring misconstruction of familiar facts, and we find in them nothing valuable which was not as clearly and more modestly said in Mr. Charles Darwin's early work, "*The Origin of Species*," which was reviewed in this magazine just ten years ago.

It is quite interesting to see the exultant triumph with which this author, who had been speculating in fancy atheism on a metaphysical basis for some years before, greeted the ingenious work of the English Naturalist, as furnishing what he calls a scientific demonstration of the dreams of the German Atheistic school. In his transport he declares it to be "one of the greatest achievements of the human mind." "Darwin's theory stands quite on a level with Newton's theory of gravitation; indeed, it even rises higher than Newton's theory." (Vol. I, pp. 25, 27.) And the cause of this excessive gratification is stated to be that "this immense domain of life cannot fail to appear, in the light of the Doctrine of Descent, no longer as the ingeniously designed work of a Creator building up according to a definite purpose, but as the necessary consequence of active causes, which are inherent in the chemical combination of matter itself, and in its physical properties." (Vol. I, p. 27.) That is to say, Mr. Darwin has equalled and even surpassed Newton in the beneficent grandeur of his discoveries, by furnishing what Hæckel calls a "mechanico-causal," and a non-miraculous "history of creation," and banishing from the human mind

the conception, and from the Universe the existence, of an intelligent Creator. Throughout the volumes this supposed consequence of the Darwinian philosophy is over and over again presented as the crowning merit of the author, and as the grandest achievement of the age, or of any age. He says :

It must sooner or later produce a complete revolution in the conception entertained by man of the entire universe. I am firmly convinced that in future this immense advance in our knowledge will be regarded as the beginning of a new period of the development of mankind. It can only be compared to the discovery made by Copernicus. Vol. II, p. 264.

Several times Mr. Hæckel pathetically laments the weakness of Darwin in declining to go the full length of his great discovery, and allowing the intervention of a Creator for the origination of the first organisms. This concession he considers to be a gratuitous abandonment of the greatest triumph of the human mind, the establishment of the "non-miraculous," the "mechanico-causal" origin of the Universe.

After mentioning very briefly a few of the leading arguments by which Mr. Hæckel undertakes to banish from creation a purpose, a meaning and a Creator, I shall leave this book to its admirers, and look once again at the foundations of a true, reasonable, and religious philosophy of nature and of the universe.

There is space for but a few of the beauties and peculiar sayings of our author. Here is one of them :

The facts of embryology alone would be sufficient to solve the question of man's position in nature, which is the highest of all problems. We may well ask what do our so-called educated circles, who think so much of the high civilization of the Nineteenth century, know of these most important biological facts, of these indispensable foundations for understanding their own organism? How much do our speculative philosophers and theologians know about them, who fancy that they can arrive at an understanding of the human organism by mere guesswork, or divine inspiration? What, indeed, do the majority of naturalists, not excepting the majority of those called zoologists (including the entomologists), know about them? The answer to this question tells much to the shame of the persons above indicated, and we must confess, willingly or unwillingly, that these invaluable facts of human

ontogeny are even at the present day utterly unknown to most people, or are in no way valued as they deserve to be. It is in the face of such a condition of things as this that we see clearly upon what a wrong and one-sided road the much-vaunted culture of the Nineteenth century still moves. Ignorance and superstition are the foundations upon which most men construct their conception of their own organism and its relation to the totality of things; and these palpable facts of the history of development, which might throw the light of truth upon them, are ignored. Vol. I, 294-5.

This is a pretty fair specimen of the Professor's self-exalting pretension. We must leave the "naturalists and the zoologists" to vindicate themselves against this charge of "ignorance and superstition." For one of the "theologians" I take leave to say that this vaunted knowledge which places the author so far above the rest of mankind, has been "familiar science" for forty years at least. And I presume that the same facts are pretty familiar by this time to the older pupils of all our High Schools.

In another place Hæckel gives us, with profound gravity, an amusing instance of the way in which the credulity of innocent scientists is played upon by humorous rustics: "By a careless slamming of a stable door the tail of a bull was wrenched off, and the calves begotten by this bull were all born without a tail." This reminds us of a witty retort of the wife of one of our earlier Presidents, which was current in our boyhood. The speculations of Lamarck were under discussion at the President's table, when Mrs. M. quietly said that the Jews had submitted to a mutilation of one of their extremities for many generations, but she had never heard that any of them were born in that condition.

The urgent anxiety of this author to give what he terms a "non-miraculous" account of creation, is the professed purpose of his book, and it is unnecessary to multiply citations to prove it. Yet some of these citations may be useful, as showing not merely the *animus* of the writer, but the palpable *non-sequitur* involved in his strongest proofs. For instance, of the nebular hypothesis he says:

It is purely mechanical or monistic, makes use exclusively of the inherent forces of eternal matter, and entirely excludes every supernatural process, every pre-arranged and conscious action of a personal Creator . . . in the

same way as Lamarck's Theory of Descent does in *Biology*, and especially in *Anthropology*. Both rest exclusively upon mechanical or unconscious causes, in no case upon pre-arranged or conscious causes. Vol. I., 323-4.

A plain man knowing something of legitimate reasoning, may well ask—how do these alleged series of facts in either case “exclude pre-arranged or conscious causes”? A watch performs its complicated movements, and tells accurately the time of day, in a purely mechanical way. It is a material thing, simple mechanism; no consciousness in the thing itself. Its capacity of orderly movement is quite parallel with the two instances cited above by our author. But does that exclude the spirit power that framed the mechanism and ordained its movement?

The utter inability of this writer to see anything in his premises, except the pre-determined conclusion in proof of which he parades them, is strikingly illustrated by the following bit of argumentation:

Many persons when contemplating these most perfect organs (the eye or ear)—which apparently were purposely invented and constructed by an ingenious Creator for a definite function, but which in reality have arisen by the aimless action of natural selection—experience difficulties in arriving at a rational understanding of them, which are similar to those experienced by the uncivilized tribes of nature when contemplating the latest complicated productions of engineering. Savages who see a ship of the line, or a locomotive engine, for the first time, look upon these objects as the productions of a supernatural being, and cannot understand how a man, an organism like themselves, could have produced such an engine. Even the uneducated classes of our own race cannot comprehend such an intricate apparatus in its actual workings; nor can they understand its purely mechanical nature. Most naturalists, however, as Darwin very justly remarks, stand in much the same position in regard to the forms of organisms as do savages to ships of the line and to locomotive engines. A rational understanding of the purely mechanical origin of organic forms can only be acquired by a thorough and general training in *Biology*, and by a special knowledge of comparative anatomy and the history of development. (Vol. II. 342-3).

Now, if the Professor could have been relieved for a little while of the strange preconception that possessed him, he could not fail to have seen that his two illustrations contain a refutation of his arguments, and an answer to his book. The material parts of his ship of the line and of his locomotive

are the smallest parts of them—necessary indeed, but utterly insignificant in comparison with the human spirit which arranged the mechanism, and ordered its movements. Indeed the Professor cheats himself with an utterly inadequate conception of the meaning of his own favorite terms—"mechanical" and "mechanico-causal." Mechanism infers something vastly superior to the mere matter of which the mechanism is composed. The words contain in themselves the assertion of contrivance, of intelligent adaptation to a purposed end. They distinctly affirm as the principal factor of the mechanism, a spiritual power beyond and above the material components of the mechanism. And this, Hæckel's "Savages," and his "uneducated classes of our own race" had sense enough to see, although the Professor himself writes in strange obliviousness of so plain a fact.

What would be the value—has it never dawned upon the Professor's mind to ask?—of the material parts of a ship, or of a locomotive, without the spirit-power that contrived and adjusted the several parts, and ordained their relations to one another? Of what value would the wood and the iron used in these grand achievements of human genius be, without the spiritual intelligence that conceived and adjusted the relations of these materials, and foresaw and ordered the result of those relations?

This is a fair specimen of Hæckel's "demonstrations." They are introduced with a great flourish of trumpets, yet almost uniformly the conclusion is not contained in the premises; and very often, as in the instance just given, the very opposite conclusion is contained in the premises.

In this connection it is pertinent to ask a question which goes down to the foundation of this book and of the entire system of pseudo-philosophy which it represents. The book claims to be a "non-miraculous History of Creation"; an account of the production of the universe and of its living inhabitants, without the aid of intelligence, without the element of design or purpose. Leaving these out is

said to make a "non-miraculous." I do not recollect whether the Professor anywhere says that it makes a rational "history of creation." Well, as to the miraculous element supposed to be eliminated by the Professor from the Universe, while we have his chosen illustrations, the ship and the locomotive, right before us, let us put the question in reference to them. Which would be the greater wonder, the greater miracle, that the ship of the line made itself, with its wondrous capacity to bear upon the ocean its formidable armament, and its living freight of a thousand warriors? Or that it was the skilled contrivance of human wisdom, working with intelligent purpose to a preconceived result? And so of the locomotive, with its wondrous power to draw upon the land a long train of heavily laden cars. Is it less miraculous, when we conceive of it as making, or evolving itself out of the inherent energy of its material elements, than when we regard it as the noble and preconceived production of human intelligence? Common sense tells us that the first suppositions involve more of wonder, more of the miracle element, than the second; just as the same common sense assures us that the first suppositions are impossible and absurd; and that the second, however wonderful, are absolutely true.

Ask the same question concerning the Universe, with its nicely balanced adaptations to the production of gloriously beneficent results, and the wonder, the miracle, is infinitely greater that it should have made or evolved itself, than that it should be the designed product of a Creative Spirit. So of the living inhabitants of this world; their self-existence, their spontaneous origination out of some inherent energy, is far more wonderful, far more miraculous, than their creation by an intelligent Spirit working to an ordered purpose by wisely adapted means.

Our Professor and his school have not then eliminated the element of miracle from the creation. But they have been quite successful in substituting, in their own minds, for a possible miracle, in consonance with human knowledge and

capacity, a monstrous conceit, impossible and absurd, according to the same human knowledge and capacity.

As already said, the main design—the purpose of Professor Hæckel's elaborate work is to do away with design and purpose in nature. One more citation to this effect will be sufficient.

Just in the same way we must judge of the many-celled organism. In it also all the useful arrangements are solely the natural and necessary result of the coöperation, differentiation, and perfecting of the individual citizens—the cells—and by no means the artificial arrangements of a Creator acting for a definite purpose. If we rightly consider this comparison, and pursue it further, we can distinctly see the perversity of that dualistic conception of nature which discovers the action of a creative plan of construction in the various adaptations of the organization of living things. (Vol. I, 302).

The theory of descent, by Lamarck and Darwin, is to work this marvel of banishing design and a Designer from the Universe. But how this is done by substituting "adaptations" for "design" it is difficult to understand.

The leading argument by which our author professes to do this is the proposition, repeated in a great variety of forms throughout his book, that what he calls "ontogenesis," the development in the foetal state of any individual form from a simple cell through all the lower animal forms up to the perfected form of the individual, is certain proof that all animal forms and every species came from one common cell, and "differentiated" itself by inherent physical energy into this wonderful variety of forms and species.

Mr. Hæckel's great teacher, Dr. Darwin, concluded from these same premises that a Spiritual Creator had ordained as the law of vital existence this development and "differentiation," and hence the "origin of species." But the more advanced disciple scouts this conclusion, and deplures the superstitious weakness that can receive it

Of course the theory, as Darwin states it, is not chargeable with, what appears to people less learned than Professor Hæckel, the absurdity of supposing in physical elements a creative energy capable of producing all the glories and the

wondrous adaptations of the Universe. But now let us hear the Professor:

The most ancient ancestors of man, as of all other organisms, were living creatures of the simplest kind imaginable, organisms without organs, like the still living Monera. . . . The first of these Monera originated in the beginning of the Laurentian period by *spontaneous generation*, . . . out of simple combinations of carbon, oxygen, hydrogen and nitrogen. The assumption of this spontaneous generation—that is of a mechanical origin of the first organisms from inorganic matter has been proved in our thirteenth chapter to be a necessary hypothesis. . . . The assumption of this first stage is necessary for most important general reasons.

The second ancestral stage of man as of all the higher animals is formed by a *simple cell*, that is a little piece of protoplasm, enclosing a kernel. There still exist large numbers of similar single-celled organisms. . . . An irrefutable proof that such single-celled primeval animals really existed as the direct ancestors of man, is furnished according to the fundamental law of biogeny, by the fact that the human egg is nothing more than a simple cell. . . . In order to form an approximate conception of the organization of those ancestors of man which first developed out of the single-celled primeval animals, it is necessary to trace the changes undergone by the human egg in the beginning of its individual development. It is just here that ontogeny guides us with the greatest certainty on to the track of philogeny. . . . This ontogenetic stage of development is a *certain proof*, that in the early primordial period, there existed ancestors of man which possessed the *form value* of a mass of homogeneous, loosely connected cells. They may be called a community of Amœbæ. (Vol. II, 278-280).]

There is a good deal more of this sort of stuff, by all of which the Professor undertakes to show that the foetal changes in the individual development of man are “certain proofs” that all specific forms came by inherent “physico-chemical” properties, from this same ancestral simple cell of man himself.

Now let us look at the extraordinary logic of this conclusion.

For six thousand years, the Professor thinks it may have been more than a hundred thousand, this process of the development of the impregnated human ovum has been going on through all the gradations of animal form under jealous watch, and never in a single instance has there resulted any form but that of a man or a woman. Therefore, says the Professor—That which we know never did happen

in six thousand years—all the years of observation—is a proof that the thing which did not happen then did most certainly happen in innumerable instances in all the previous time! On what basis can we reason with people who wander thus wildly from the very foundations of all reason! Who affirm that because a thing has never happened therefore it must have happened continually! That the thing which has never been must needs be! That our actual knowledge showing one thing, *proves* the contrary of what it shows!

Yet it is of this transparent antithesis of logic and of common reason that the Professor thus discourses with sublime complacency :

By our theory the mystical veil of the miraculous and supernatural, which has hitherto been allowed to hide the complicated phenomena of this branch of natural knowledge, is removed. All the departments of Botany and Zoology, and especially the most important portion of the latter, Anthropology become reasonable. The dimming mirage of mythological fiction can no longer exist in the clear sunlight of scientific knowledge. (Vol. I., 11).

As to the "mystical veil" and the miraculous," we have already seen that there is far more of them, of thaumaturgy, of wonder-working, of the inconceivable, in the Professor's theory, attributing to unconscious matter intrinsic power to do the works of God, than in the reasonable belief of mankind that these miracles attest the beneficent purpose of a Designing Mind, of an Almighty Spirit.

On the postulate of creation by an Almighty Spirit, ordaining the law of Development and growth of every living thing, "after its kind," the fact of a common type for vegetable forms, of a common type for animal forms, is natural and reasonable, beautifully attesting the Unity of the One Creative Spirit. That the foetal Development of each individual should be through all the successive stages of this common type, from the lowest to the perfected specific form of the individual, is alike natural, reasonable, and in precise accord with the law of specific development.

And in this fact is the natural and reasonable explanation of the existence of aborted or undeveloped parts of an organism.

We must now leave this pretentious and most illogical book, and try to look at the very substance of the issue between Matter and Spirit, as the cause of causes, as the active, originating power of the Universe. The strange and portentous revival of materialism in our day is shown, not only in these Atheistic theories, but in the very heart of Christian theology. The attempt to identify or confuse the God and Saviour of men with two of the material gifts of God for human nourishment—chosen by Him as the Symbols of His mercy and grace in Jesus Christ our Lord, would seem to come from the same senile decay of human faculties: a decay which marked the Lucretian epoch of an earlier civilization.

Let us put aside, for the present, the little specialties of natural history which are so industriously used by one class of naturalists as weapons vs. Christianity, and come at once to the root question which underlies all these assaults, and gives to them all they have of meaning and effect. Decide this question either way, and these mere specialties are deprived of all value and significance in the great issue between religion and atheism. Decide it rightly, and the whole body of Christian truth follows, in logical sequence.

The same question has been recurring in all the active ages of the world. There is nothing in modern culture or discovery which at all changes the old fundamental problem of the origin, the nature and the destiny of man. There is but this difference: Christianity on the one side, modern research on the other, have thrown a brighter light upon the old question of the ages, enabling us to read it more clearly, and to resolve it more perfectly.

The simplest, the most elementary, form of this old question is: Is that substance which the senses reveal to us, which we see and feel, the only existence in the universe?

Is this visible substance, self-existent, self-acting, and of its own inherent energy the producer of all the innumera-

ble forms of being in heaven and in earth? Or, is there another substance of which the senses can take no cognizance, self-existent, self-acting, and ever exercising a controlling and a formative power over the visible—the material substance?

The consentient testimony of mankind, undisturbed by subtle speculation, and the universal construction of human language, affirm the postulate contained in the latter of these interrogatories. For the very question can not be stated without implying the affirmation. The world, the nature, which the senses reveal to us; the matter which we see and handle, implies a fundamental distinction between the thing seen and the perceiving agent.

Again, all human art and all science are founded upon the postulate of the essential inertia, the immobility and passive subjection of the material universe to laws impressed upon it by a superior power. If these material elements with which we deal, in the rudest and in the most advanced arts, were possessed of intelligence and will and intrinsic energy, with what confidence could we manipulate them into any forms or apply them to any uses? But knowing from daily experience the essential inertia and passive subjection of matter, and ever learning more perfectly the laws by which it is controlled and moved, distributed and compounded, the spirit that is in man can wield it to his will, make it subservient to his profit and his pleasure, and, leaving the earth, can soar away into the abyss of space, and tell with unflinching precision the track in which those far-distant worlds will move in unresisting subjection to the law impressed upon them by an Omnipotent Spirit. Now mark the difference. The same man of science who can tell at any moment the place and movement of the stars in their courses can not tell where his little son has gone, or into what dangers he may fall when out of his own sight, because that son is more than passive matter, higher than the stars in rank; is a soul, a spirit, and glories in the prerogative of intelligence and will.

Although this inertia, this passive subjection of matter to laws impressed by a power superior to itself, is plain and obvious, yet there is an unconscious jugglery by which this conclusion is confused and contradicted.

The most common instance of self-deception on the part of the enemies of Christianity is to enlarge or diminish their computations of time and space beyond the limits of conceivability, and then to affirm of this inconceivable quantity whatever the exigencies of a theory may require, in the confidence that the most extravagant assertion can not be *tested*, and by consequence *corrected*, by the ordinary criteria of sense, experience and judgment. They soar into an empyrean, or dive into an abyss, where no human faculties can follow them, and then wildly declaim about the powers and capacities hidden in these inconceivables. Immeasurable space, illimitable time, infinitesimal division, are assumed to have endowed elemental matter with properties and energies of which there is no human experience; with properties and energies in absolute contradiction of all that we do know within the limits of observation and actual conception!

Thus we know that there is no self-moving or creative power in a stone, or in a metal, in a piece of flesh, or in a gross organ like the liver or the stomach, or the solid substance of the brain, in present or in any historic time. But transfer the particles of which these substances are composed into the inconceivables of infinitesimal division and illimitable time, and we can boldly postulate of them any amount of self-moving energy and of creative power. For now we are beyond the salutary limit of instant correction by the criteria of sense, experience and judgment.

A moderate degree of reflection ought to assure us that a large mass is but the sum of the particles of which it is the aggregate; that a compound body is but the sum of the elements of which it is composed; and that by no possibility can there be anything in the particles or in the elements which is not also in the mass or in the compound.

Modern research furnishes us with a very apt and beautiful illustration of the falseness of the conceit, that tenuity and subtlety can change the essential nature of matter. Electricity, whether a substance or a mode of physical force, is the subtlest and the most active form of matter or of physical force known to men. In these particulars it transcends the limit of human comprehension. Yet it is amenable to the universal physical law or condition of inertia. It has no self-moving, no creative power. It waits upon command, from impulse from without. And the instructed boy or maiden will sit at the proper instrument, and order and control this wonderfully subtle and tremendous energy as calmly and effectually as the sculptor uses his chisel, the painter his brush, or the blacksmith his hammer.

The power of the boy or maiden is in its essence different from any and all physical forces. It is soul power—spirit power; an emanation from the Infinite Spirit that created and controls the universe. The essential nature of this spirit is self-conscious, self-moving and creative activity. God has endowed this image of Himself with the mastery of this world, and of all its material elements and forces.

The conclusion of the jugglery to which I have referred, is the astounding theory that the material universe made itself by an eternal whirl, which, some time or other, assumed the condition of orderly progression. And this is the substitute proposed to intelligent men for that account of origins which is contemptuously dismissed as the theory of creation. This material theory has the fatal defect of not telling us how the imagined whirl commenced in a nature, which, as far as we know it, is essentially inert and passive. It gives us no reasonable beginning—no starting point—that human reason can acknowledge as sufficient. Still further is it from telling us how the whirl was changed into orderly and beneficent progression; how came the wonderful and beauteous forms of crystallization, each definite and invariable, and all the miracles of vegetable and animal growth.

Another theory of origins, another account of the cause—the invariable antecedent of the ultimate facts of nature—suggests a supreme mind, like to our own, without its limitations, as the required and the sufficient cause.

This theory has the advantage of the preceding, in that instead of contradicting known facts, instead of assuming in material elements a power and capacity of which we have no example in those elements, and in opposition to our actual knowledge of them, it is in beautiful accordance with a large and prominent class of facts of which we have the most perfect knowledge, even our own perpetual consciousness. We know that in us, or of us, there is a something which we call spirit—which indeed we recognize as emphatically *ourselves*; a spirit which has, and continually uses, the power to originate actions; which has, and continually uses, the power to control nature, the power to separate and combine material elements into new forms of being; the power to control and use at man's pleasure the matter which composes his own body; a force which can originate motion and overcome the immobility of matter. Man is conscious of being, by the exercise of an inherent activity, within a limited sphere, a creator.

Now which of these theories is the more reasonable? That which contradicts all we do know? Or that which is in perfect accord with our actual knowledge?

At this point the believing Christian leaves the domain of theory and induction, and finds in a proved revelation from God the confirmation of all that reason had so plainly inferred. That tells us: "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth. And the earth was without form and void; and darkness was upon the face of the deep, and the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters." (Gen. i: 1, 2.)

In perfect accordance with what we know and experience every day of the power of our own spirit over physical nature, this brooding of the Eternal Spirit upon the chaos was the preliminary and essential condition of that long

series of miracles and mysteries by which the earth was prepared for its living inhabitants. Here, in the action of power, of which we are conscious in ourselves, was the beginning of movement, of order, of the supremacy of law, of progression to a purpose, in the nature that we see. Then, by the might of the same energizing and life-giving spirit, was the now-formed and shapen earth endowed with fruitfulness to bring forth the grand procession of living creatures which have disported themselves in the waters and and on the land since the mighty fiat went forth, "Let the earth bring forth grass, the herb yielding seed, and the fruit tree yielding fruit after his kind, whose seed is in itself, upon the earth; and it was so. Let the waters bring forth abundantly the moving creature that hath life. Let the earth bring forth the living creature after his kind, cattle and creeping thing, and beast of the earth after his kind, and it was so." (Gen. i: 11, 20, 24.)

By the force of Personal Will, by the might of Spiritual power, Nature began to be—began, *crescere*, to grow; began its majestic progress to the consummation that we see. And Christian faith assures us that it will go on to a grander consummation, when "this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality."

To the Christian philosopher, humble enough to be taught of God, wise enough to go to the fountain of wisdom for instruction, how grand and satisfying is this account of "origins"—the beginning of the nature that surrounds us, and of which we are a part!

And how miserably trifling, how worse than child's play, are the poor attempts of the atheists of all ages to imagine a scheme of the world fashioning itself out of itself, without the concurrence of an infinite will, without the fiat of an Almighty mind!

I do not in this argument cite the Scriptures as proof of what they assert, but to show that they give a better, truer, more consistent and more philosophical account of things

as they are, and as we know them, than all the fables and guesses of these atheistic scientists. Talk of the fables of Mythology! There is hardly one of them that equals in extravagance and absurdity these fables of pseudo-science, with solemn gravity building up the universe out of self-existent and self-moving material monads!

A good deal of popular capital is made by these fanciful world-makers by the constantly-repeated boast that they alone are the progressives—the advanced thinkers—while the rest of mankind are stumbling about in the old ruts of an exploded philosophy and in the dim shadows of a worn-out religion.

On the contrary, the most adventurous theses of the present day, striving with infinite conceit to frame a universe without a God, are but the revamping of worn-out absurdities of two thousand years ago. The foremost man of the sect has ingenuously confessed that he is but the follower of Lucretius, as he of Epicurus.

A very old and illustrious writer, adopting and expanding the dictum of Lord Bacon, gives this just and graphic account of these men and their performances:

A little knowledge of philosophy is apt to make men's heads dizzy, and in danger of falling into the gulf of atheism; but a more careful and diligent view of it brings them into sobriety and their right wits again. Such a slight inspection had the followers of Epicurus into the nature of things, for when they found how, in the present state of the world, the various motion and configuration of the particles of matter would handsomely solve many appearances of nature, they, drunk with the success, reel presently into an infinite space, and there imagine they behold infinite worlds made of the concretion of atoms; and ever since their eyes have been so dusted with these little atoms that they could see nothing else in the world but them." (Stillington, *Origines Sacrae*, Vol. I, p. 501.)

While we are in the company of such intellectual giants as Bacon and Stillingfleet, let us listen to like words of wisdom from one whose name stands forth upon the pages of history as the most illustrious that the medical profession has given to the world, Claudius Galen. Lucretius gives us the latest modern formula of atheistic philosophy, as well as

that of his own age, in this language: "No parts of man's body (or of any animal body) were *designed* for that use which they are employed for; but the parts, by chance, fell into that form they are in, and men by degrees brought them to their present use and serviceableness." This is the old-time Darwinism, one thousand six hundred years old. To refute this profane extravagance Galen composed his treatise, "*De Usu Partium*," which Gassendus thinks Galen wrote with a kind of enthusiasm upon him, so that all those seventeen books of his on that subject, heathen though he was, are a kind of CXIXth Psalm in philosophy, or a perpetual hymn upon the praise of the great Creator.

If I am not very much mistaken there has now been presented a combination of fact and reason, making a moral demonstration that the universe was created by a spiritual, self-moving Power, 'analogous to that spiritual power of which we are conscious as a part of ourselves. The only answer I have ever heard attempted to this demonstration is the oracular speech, "Oh, that is pure Anthropomorphism!" As if this single word, by a magical charm, effectually blotted out the Deity and common sense together. Surely it is more reasonable to conceive of Deity as a Spirit, like to the active and creative spirit in man, than to make of brute beasts and of unconscious atoms a Deity, capable of producing the wonders and the glories of animate and of inanimate nature!

The most general division of human knowledge, is unto physics and metaphysics—that is, physical science and moral science. Observe here, however, that physical science postulates spirit as inevitably as moral science. For, in the former there are not only facts to be observed, classified and known, but there is besides, and above them, a being, a mind, a person, to observe, to classify and to know.

In the spiritual sphere the limits of mere human discovery are soon reached. Consciousness is the only field which the unaided mind can explore for the discovery of these

phenomena. But consciousness can tell us nothing about that which the soul most hungers to know, the relation of the human spirit to the great creative and governing Spirit, whose existence, as we have seen, reason compels us to recognize, and of whom we have a further testimony in consciousness itself, in the universal sense of right and wrong, in the universal sense of a *moral law*, for the observance or breach of which we are responsible to a law-giver and judge.

The immeasurable superiority of the spiritual nature that is in man over material nature, the subordination of all material elements to this spiritual power, and the fact of this moral law as the condition and mode of spiritual being, give a sufficient reason, and the only possible reason, for a very large and prominent class of the phenomena of life. Pain, suffering, disease and death, are the sanctions of the moral law, and the certain penalties for its violation. But only the spiritual nature is amenable to this law, and can recognize its existence. And to this spiritual nature these penalties of sin are not only penal but disciplinary and remedial. They are essential conditions of the highest human excellence. The spiritual nature rises under their healthful discipline to its noblest reach of attainment. The animal nature would never have chosen, if it had the power of choice, pain, suffering, disease and death as the path of its development. They only belong as beneficial accessories to the spiritual sphere. And the almost infinite exaltation of spirit over matter is wonderfully illustrated by the subjection of all animal life to those laws and accessories of spiritual life. This subjection of inferior creatures to the law appropriate only to human development proves that this world was made for man, its delegated master and lord. So science, so philosophy teach. Divine faith goes further and tells of a better home and a higher, prepared for those who have climbed the heights here, who have done well the work given them to do: a home eternal in the heavens, prepared for those who love God, and keep His commandments.

The Blessed, Creative Spirit has met and satisfied the eager craving of the human spirit for a knowledge of Himself and of our relations to him by a distinct, special revelation, and with beautiful appropriateness this special revelation is made in words, in human language. As man in his complex nature is embodied spirit, so language is embodied reason. One name of God is The Logos, The Word. Speech is the most perfect expression of reason, and essential to the exercise of this divinest faculty, except in the most rudimentary degree.

JAMES CRAIK.

CHAPELS.

In the last few years in this country several cases of very serious trouble have arisen between some chapels and the churches with which they were connected, in more than one instance involving very bitter hostilities between the two organizations, and litigation in the Law Courts. That such things should have occurred, is proof that there must be some uncertainty and lack of proper definition in our ecclesiastical legislation in regard to the position and relationship of Chapels. There is in fact no reference whatever, and no legislation in regard to chapels, except their mere mention by name in the office for the consecration of a church or "chapel" in the Prayer Book, and in one or two of the Canons. And that uncertainty and differences in regard to them should have arisen under such circumstances, is not to be wondered at.

It is certainly the fault of our American Canons that they are not a complete body of laws for our church government. They are simply a heterogeneous mass of canons, enacted from time to time, as occasions have arisen requiring adjudication. There are many subjects, as the case in

point, on which they are entirely silent, and others in regard to which the legislation is very fragmentary and uncertain. It is true there is in addition to our own Canon Law, the canons and many ecclesiastical decisions of our Mother Church of England, with which we were at one time identified. But it has always been a disputed point among American Churchmen, and one in regard to which no authoritative decision has ever been reached, how far that legislation is applicable and of force in this country. And even if it were determined that the English law was binding, there would still be much uncertainty, owing to the great difference of the legal position of the Church in this country from that in England. That the English law would afford an admirable basis for our legislation is unquestionable, and it is to it that we propose to appeal in regard to the matter we are discussing; but what is required is a digest and adaptation of that law to the circumstances of the Church in America. And what we propose to ask in regard to this matter of chapels, about which we think it is evident there is necessity for a more distinct understanding than now exists, is how far the English law in regard to them is applicable to the state of things here.

Chapels have existed from a very early period in England, and their various kinds and positions have been distinctly recognized and defined by law. There are indeed some ambiguities and uncertainties in regard to some of them, owing to the many complications of English civil and ecclesiastical law, special privileges, etc., but their general character and features are clearly marked, and it is believed that the following statements in regard to them cannot be questioned. In the first place there are various classes of Chapels: as, Chapels of Ease, Parochial Chapels, Private Chapels, Royal Chapels, Free Chapels, Chapels of colleges, public institutions, etc., each of which have a distinct position, rights or obligations of their own.

Now let us remark here, that we need the recognition in our legislation of similar differences in this country, a defi-

dition of the respective classes, the circumstances under which they may be erected, and the privileges pertaining to them, for we have many of these different kinds of chapels in existence, and in default of the recognition of these distinctions, and any prescription of their position and rights, there is uncertainty and danger of conflict. For instance, the canons of the General Church leave the formation of new parishes and the establishment of new churches in the hands of the ecclesiastical authorities. Does that include chapels, or is it intended to refer only to churches which are strictly parochial? The point has been much disputed. Many rectors have asserted their right to build chapels for the better accommodation of their parishioners, without asking the assent of the ecclesiastical authorities. And in several of the Dioceses we believe it has been the common practice for such chapels to be erected without any permission being obtained. Yet does not the spirit of the canon cover such cases? Or would it be a violation of vested interests to so interpret it? So, too, as regards private chapels: have individuals a right to build chapels on their own estates, or in connection with their own houses, without permission or license of the Ordinary? Have public institutions, colleges, asylums, etc., a right to build chapels for the benefit of their own inmates without such license? And if they have, can they open such chapels to the attendance of persons outside of the institution to which they belong, and if they can, will that not be quite as likely to interfere with the rights and work of neighboring parochial churches as the establishment of a new parish would, which is controlled by law? The old Canon law made the consent of the Bishop necessary to the establishment of any new place of worship, and no clergyman could celebrate the sacraments, under severe penalties, except in case of urgent necessity, in any place not licensed for that purpose by the Ordinary.

In this country we have nothing corresponding to the requirements of such license, apart from the canon in regard

to the formation of new parishes, except the provision in the individual dioceses, which obtains in one form or another, that to entitle a clergyman to a seat in the Diocesan Convention, he must be engaged in some work recognized or approved of the Bishop. But if a clergyman chooses to forego this privilege, may he still be employed by another clergyman, or by the trustees or vestry of some chapel not recognized by the Bishop, without subjecting himself to canonical censure? There is indeed the canon on intrusion, prohibiting a clergyman from officiating within the "parochial cure" of another. But in the absence of parish boundaries what constitutes that cure? The canon says "the limits, as now fixed by law, of any village, town, township," etc., shall be considered as the limits of the parish, and if there are more than one clergyman within such town or district the consent of all of them must be obtained. But if this is to be taken literally no clergyman could officiate in any church, even with the consent of the rector thereof, without the consent of all the other clergymen in the same district, unless the position is assumed that all the settled clergy within such district are tenants-in-common of a joint parish, each having the right to officiate himself or by his deputy without the consent of the others. And if this will hold, then it must follow that each one of those clergymen has the right, if this canon is the only one applying, to erect and officiate himself, or by his deputy, in a chapel or private house anywhere within that district, as well as in his own particular church, without the consent of the other clergy. Nor would there be any necessity for the consent of the Bishop. In a civil district, therefore, each of the rectors thereof, would have the right to build as many chapels as they chose, and appoint clergymen to officiate therein, without the permission or in defiance of the ecclesiastical authority. The only thing the Bishop could do if he disapproved of it, would be to deprive the clergy so officiating of seats in the Diocesan Convention.

This right of churches to erect chapels without asking eccle-

siastical consent, is one which has already in more than one instance given rise to discussion and contention, and excited no little bitterness of feeling among neighboring clergymen. And in the future there is likely to arise question as to the erection of conventional chapels, chapels for the use of sisterhoods. On the one side it will be argued that a body of women associated together for religious work, certainly ought to be able to have special opportunities for worship under their own control, and on their own personal property; and on the other hand it will be asked why such churches should be exempt from ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and whether, if persons outside the sisterhood are allowed to attend them, they will not be quite as likely to interfere with neighboring churches as the erection of a new parish would be. And the same is true in regard to chapels of public institutions. On these and other accounts it would seem to be necessary that the different kinds of chapels, and the circumstances under which they may be erected, should be more distinctly recognized and determined by our Canon law, than is the case now.

In the second place we enquire how far the different kinds of chapels that are actually found in this country, correspond to, and should be governed by the same principles affecting, the various classes recognized by the English Law.

Royal Chapels and Free Chapels, that is, chapels exempt from all ecclesiastical jurisdiction and control by Royal or Papal privileges, of course we have none. Strictly Private Chapels, that is, chapels attached to private residences, we have but few, though there are such, and it is conceivable that they may increase, and that their increase under absolutely no law concerning them, might give rise to grave disorders, questions as to the right of the clergy to officiate in them, as to whether they were private or not, or whether they interfered with the rights of parish churches. The old catholic law that no altar could be erected anywhere without the consent of the Bishop, seems the only safe and

proper one, though it would certainly be well to have specified by canon the circumstances under which that consent should be given, to prevent anything like Episcopal tyranny.

As to Chapels of Colleges, Hospitals and other public institutions, we have many such, and their position is almost identical with those in England, and should be governed by the same rules. But they should be distinctly provided for, both as regards the recognition of the Bishop, and as to their relation to parochial churches. Many such chapels are now assuming, in addition to the purpose for which they are ostensibly intended, the ends of a parish church. And it is often an easy and desirable way of providing for an otherwise neglected district. But there should be distinct permission and recognition for the object they are to serve, to prevent conflict and jealousy from the parochial clergy.

We come then to Chapels of Ease and Parochial Chapels, both of which classes actually obtain in this country, though there is no little confusion in regard to them, and it is chiefly owing to this confusion that the conflicts we have referred to have arisen. Let us see just what is the difference between these two classes of chapels in England, and then whether the same differences do not exist here, and whether the English law is not therefore applicable. In Burns' "Ecclesiastical Law," under the head of "Chapels," we find :

Of chapels subject to a Mother Church, some are merely Chapels of Ease, others Chapels of Ease and Parochial. A chapel merely of ease is that which is used only for ease of the parishioners in prayers and preaching (sacraments and burials being received and performed at the Mother Church), and commonly where the curate is removable at the pleasure of the parochial minister. . . . A parochial chapel is that which hath the parochial rights of christening and burying, and thus differeth in nothing from a church but in want of a rectory and endowment. For the privilege of administering the sacraments and office of burial are the proper rights and jurisdiction that make it no longer a depending chapel of ease, but a separate parochial chapel.

Dean Hook in his Church Dictionary says:

Chapels of Ease, built for the ease of parishioners who live at too great distance from the parish church, by the clergy of which the services of the chapel are performed. Parochial chapels differ from chapels of ease on account of their having a permanent minister or incumbent, though they are in some degree dependant upon the Mother Church.

A Chapel of Ease and a Parochial Chapel are then both "dependant in some degree upon a church," but in the first the higher offices of the church are not ordinarily performed, nor has it a permanent minister; it is usually served by the clergy of the parish church; the latter has all the offices of the church and a permanent minister,—it is simply inferior to a church in dignity of name, and in the importance and responsibilities of an independant position. These two classes of chapels are very distinctly marked in England, and the position and rights of their clergy defined accordingly. Now how is it with us? We have the two classes, but they are not as clearly defined, hence the confusion and trouble that have arisen. We have many country churches which have chapels attached to them for the benefit of those at too great a distance ordinarily to attend the parish church, where service is held by the clergy of the church at hours when they are not engaged there. Many country clergy have services in their own church on Sunday morning and evening, and in the afternoon hold service in a distant chapel. But the attendants of such chapels are considered as members of the parish church, and ordinarily resort thither for the sacraments. So, too, many of our city churches have mission chapels among the poor, which are similarly placed and similarly worked. Such chapels are properly merely chapels of ease, and should be regarded as such.

But on the other hand we have chapels, some of which have originated in this way, but have grown to so much importance as to necessitate the appointment of a clergyman to their entire care, where services are held as regularly and fully as in a church, where there is to all intents and purposes a separate congregation and a separate pastor. Such

a chapel corresponds exactly to an English parochial chapel, and should be recognized as such. Such chapels in England are called "a reputed parish," being such in all respects but in name. Their dependance upon the mother church is simply in regard to their origin, as being derived from it, their name, that they may not detract from its dignity, or—in England—that they may not lessen the titles belonging to the mother church; or, in this country, owing to the necessity of deriving still some portion of their support from the parent, or, if through change of population or other causes she is becoming weak, of upholding and supporting her; such reasons necessitate the continuance of the name and position of chapel, while according the full rights which belong to what is really a distinct and important congregation.

In the first of these classes there is entire dependence; it is of the character of a mission work among those who are unable to provide for or support work for themselves. It is simply a clergyman giving his services freely to those who can make little or no return, or who in this way is trying to lay the foundation of a future parish; and as the number of persons connected with such chapels is generally not large enough to necessitate any division of the cure, the clergy of the church, without giving up any of their own work, can visit, come to know and attend to those who worship at the chapel.

But in the other case the congregation is large enough to provide for and support itself, or at least to require the entire time and attention and the full offices of a clergyman, and on that account it is but right that it should have the same independence and privileges as a church.

The most important distinction between these classes of chapels is in regard to the position of their minister. The first does not require a distinct minister: it is "served by the clergy of the parish church." The second has a "permanent minister," one appointed to its care as a distinct congregation. Such persons in England are called Perpet-

nal Curates. Burns' Ecclesiastical Law, under head of "Curates," says: "The origin of perpetual curacies was by statute of the 4 H IV C. 12, it is enacted that 'in every church appropriated there shall be a secular person ordained vicar perpetual, canonically instituted and inducted, and covenantably endowed by the discretion of the ordinary.'" While under head of "appropriation" it is said "a vicarage by endowment becomes a benefice, distinct from the parsonage." And the same authority recognizes the providing for the support of a church by pew rents or voluntary contributions as equivalent to endowment, that is, appropriation. In the case even of chapels, the appointment to which was in the hands of the rector of the parish in which it was situated, it was ordained in reference to Queen Anne's county by 1 G., ft 2, C. 10:

In case of a chapel the incumbent of the mother church might refuse to employ a curate and officiate there himself, and take benefit of augmentation, whereby the maintenance of curate would be sunk; therefore such curacies shall be perpetual cures and benefices, and the ministers bodies politic and corporate, and have perpetual succession.

So Blunt in his "Book of Church Law," Book III, chap. 2, says, "There are certain benefices with cure of souls called perpetual curacies, which are in almost all respects to be treated as other benefices."

It is evident, therefore, that the English law recognizes every chapel that has a "minister of its own," a clergyman appointed to its entire and exclusive care, and in which all the offices of the church are celebrated, as a distinct benefice, regards its clergy as belonging to the class of beneficed clergy who have the rights and responsibilities of a parochus or parish priest, and who cannot be removed from their position except by due process of canonical law. And this agrees with the old Catholic Canon law. Dr. S. B. Smith in his Elements of Ecclesiastical Law, says, speaking of the different kinds of the *cura animarum*, that there is—

The *cura habitualis et actualis*. A person is said to have the *cura habitualis* when he neither does nor can *de facto* exercise it, though he can and

should see that it is exercised by another person. On the other hand, a person who, *de facto*, has the right to exercise the *cura*, is said to have the *cura actualis*. Thus a cathedral chapter to which the *cura* is attached, has the *cura habitualis* only—is *parochus habitualis*—while the vicar appointed by it to exercise the *cura* has the *cura actualis*, and is, properly speaking, the *parochus*.

And in answer to the question "What *cura* is essential to the office of parish priest?" says:

The *cura habitualis* is not sufficient. . . . The *cura actualis*, however, is sufficient, even without the *cura habitualis*. Thus the parochial vicar appointed by a chapter having the *cura habitualis* is a true parish priest.

The same, of course, would be true of a clergyman appointed to the care of a chapel within the parish of another. Dr. Smith gives as the canonical definition of "a parish priest (*parochus*, *rector*, *curatus*, *personna*, *pastor*), a person lawfully appointed to exercise in his own name and *ex obligatione*, the *cura animarum*—that is, to preach the word of God and administer the sacraments to a determinate number of the faithful of a diocese." Therefore a clergyman who is appointed to the exclusive spiritual charge of the congregation of a chapel, who is alone responsible for visiting, instructing and ministering to the people belonging to it, has properly the cure of souls for that congregation, and such a chapel is properly a parochial chapel or "reputed parish," and its minister should be regarded as a beneficed clergyman, though he be not called rector.

It would be an interesting question to discuss whether, in a parish where there was but one church, and yet where the people were too numerous to be attended to by one priest, there could be an actual division of the cure of souls so that there should be several parish priests in the same church. Dr. Smith says "the question is controverted," and adds that "it is admitted by all that, as a rule, it is more expedient that but one parish priest should be placed over a parish." It certainly seems necessary on many accounts that there should be but one head, and yet it were far better that in our large churches a division of the cure should be made, rather than that one priest should have a nominal

cure he cannot possibly exercise. To attempt to discharge it with the aid of a young and inexperienced deacon is impossible. But to secure the help of fit and able priests the position must and should be made more coördinate and permanent. Whether this should extend to actual immovability is a question. It certainly should include, what is secured to every curate by the English law, a six months' notice, at least, of a termination. To have any class of our clergy subject, as all our assistant ministers are in this country, to instantaneous dismissal and termination of their salary, is to place them in a position more ignominious and precarious than that of almost any other, even the lowest class of officials. But whatever should be the case where there is but one church, where there are two within a given district there seems to be no reason why a division of the cure may not take place. There may be reasons such as those indicated above, why it may not be desirable for the division to extend so far as the actual constitution of both churches as rectories, but if it goes so far as to the appointment of a separate clergyman to the care of each church, with power for the full celebration of the offices of the Church in each, then there is practically two separate cure of souls, and whatever may be their respective titles, spiritually, in the canon law, the position of the clergy of each should be regarded as equal and independent. And it is high time that the provisions of the English law, which recognize such chapels as "Parochial," not "Chapels of Ease," and define and protect the position of their clergy, should be distinctly acknowledged as applicable with us. There is indeed a theory, not founded, it is believed, on any canonical authority whatever, that in such cases the cure of souls of the whole parish belongs to the rector, but that he temporarily delegates it to another, and may reassume it at any time. But what right has he *temporarily* to delegate what he is *permanently* incapable of discharging.

The *primary* cure does indeed belong to him, as the cure of the whole diocese belongs to the Bishop; but as when

the Bishop has delegated his cure by assenting to the establishment of parishes, he cannot again assume that cure and dismiss at will a rector; so when a rector has delegated his cure by assenting to the establishment of a chapel and the appointment of a vicar, he has no right to reassume his cure and dismiss the vicar. Such a theory would be most unjust, both to the clergy in charge of such chapels and to their congregations. It is unjust to the clergy because, practically, to all intents and purposes, their position is identical with that of a rector, and therefore it is only proper that they should have the same rights and privileges. It is unjust, because such clergy have all the responsibilities of a cure of souls, and therefore they should be answerable directly for that cure, not mediately through another. It is unjust, because, having that responsibility, they should be at liberty to discharge it according to their own discretion, and not by methods dictated by another, whose propriety or expediency they may not be able to approve. It is unjust because giving their time and labor to an independant work of their own, they may not be allowed to reap the fruit of it, if they are removable at the will of another. And it is unjust to the congregation, because being a distinct congregation it should have the choice of its own pastor. With the exception of the ministers of chapels in the American Church, the Roman Catholic is the only religious body in this country whose pastors are not appointed by the congregations to whom they are to minister, or by their immediate representatives. And some of the worst troubles to which we have referred in regard to chapels, have arisen from the attempted removal of their clergy by a rector, who often has no real interest in or knowledge even of the congregation itself, but is actuated by mere personal or private motives, without consulting, and against the wish of the congregation. It is indeed argued in opposition to this that although a chapel may have reached the size and importance to justify and demand the entire services of a clergyman, that till so long as it is a chapel it is in a position of subordina-

tion, and must not expect the rights of a church. But the subordination certainly should not be greater than the necessities of the case demand; it should not be out of proportion to the benefit gained by the position of a chapel; it should not be carried to the extent of the violation of natural and moral rights, and the universally guaranteed privileges of the canon law. In the question of the appointment to the cure of the chapel, if the mother church contributes entirely the support of the chapel, it should have the sole right of appointment; if it contributes anything it should have some share in the appointment, or if it entirely built the chapel it would be perfectly just that it should make the first appointment. That would be in accordance with the universal rule in regard to the right of patrons. If one builds and endows a church, it has always been admitted that the right of presentation to the benefice vests in him and his heirs in perpetuity, if he chooses so to reserve it. If one builds but does not endow, he might be allowed to make the first presentation, but that afterwards should vest in the congregation actually supporting the church by pews-rents or contributions, or in whoever does support it. So if a chapel is supported entirely by another church, it is perfectly just and natural that it should be subordinate in regard to the appointment to the cure; or if it still contributes part of this support, it should have some voice in the nomination. But if it contributes nothing, in all justice and fairness and in all wisdom, the appointment belongs to the congregation affording the support. But in either case when the appointment is once made, the clergyman should have the freedom and independency and permanency which belongs of right to every one having cure of souls of a congregation. But it is argued further that as a chapel bears the name of a church, it is to be regarded as part of a common organization, and that the rector of the parish is responsible for the whole, should have the oversight and direction of the whole, and is answerable for the practices and views of all the clergy and teachers within it, even of those in charge of

separate chapels. But such is not the theory of the Christian priesthood. It is instituting a new office in the church. It is erecting an *imperium in imperio*, which in the case of a large and wealthy corporation, with many subordinate chapels, might lead to the establishment of a very powerful spiritual monopoly, so to speak, within a diocese, to say nothing of the injustice to the individual priests concerned. There has been a Catholic custom of the appointment of deans and archdeacons for certain purposes of visitation and intermediate government between the Bishops and the lower clergy, but in no case does this power extend to the removal of the clergy from their cures without a canonical trial. But it is a new thing, certainly without any canonical authority, and one of the dangers into which we are likely to fall by our loose way of doing things in this country, through lack of proper canonical provision, and which cannot but breed hardship and mischief, that a rector should hold a number of clergy in charge of chapels, some of which are perhaps as large and important as his own immediate cure, in absolute subjection, simply dependant upon, and removable at, his individual pleasure.

And that this is not the theory of our legislation, *as far as it goes*, is shown by the fact that the office for the consecration of a church in the Prayer Book may be used equally for the consecration of a chapel, which would prove certainly that there may be chapels having all the spiritual privileges of a church, and that the office for the Institution of a Rector, may be used for the Institution of an Assistant Minister. This latter fact clearly shows that the church contemplates a class of assistant ministers who belong to the instituted or beneficed clergy, to whom is committed exactly the same cure of souls as to a rector, and who are in the letter of institution declared to be directly responsible to the Bishop. That same letter shows that a dissolution of the relation between such an assistant "and the congregation committed to his charge," can only be brought about by the priest himself or his congregation; or, in case of a

difference between him and the congregation, by "the Bishop with the advice of our (his) presbyters." And who are the assistant ministers thus contemplated but those in charge of separate chapels? Yet where in the American Church are the assistants whose position is thus recognized? Through lack of canonical definition and provision for the office as contemplated in the Prayer Book and in the old canon law, in almost every case the rectors in whose parishes there are chapels, have managed through keeping up a nominal supervision or system of rotation in officiating, or by insisting upon a theory that chapels which are really "parochial" are only "of ease," to keep the clergy who have thus actual charge, in the position of mere personal assistants, entirely under their direction and removable at their pleasure.

But if the principles enunciated above are true, and it is believed they cannot be controverted, such a position is both in contravention of the theory of the Christian Priesthood, of the universal canon law of the church, and of every principle of justice and equity to the clergy and congregations concerned. No wonder it has led to confusion and trouble.

There are in this country so many chapels which are simply missions, and so properly only chapels of ease, and the various positions occupied by our clergy are so carelessly defined, that the common conception of a chapel has come to be that of a church entirely dependent upon and subordinate to another, the congregation of which has no rights and deserves no consideration, and its clergy, no matter how important or difficult their work or great their responsibilities, are entirely at the bidding and mercy of a rector who may have little or no interest in, and for whom it may be impossible to understand or realize the character of, the work in hand. And in so many cases chapels which have been started as chapels of ease, have only gradually grown into and reached the position of parochial chapels, that the real distinctions, and the conditions creating that

distinction, are lost sight of. So that though we have both classes of chapels, with their respective character of clergy, there is little or no practical discrimination in regard to them. Hence the cases of difficulty and injustice that have arisen.

We conclude, then, that in reference to this matter of chapels there is need of definite canonical regulations as to the different kinds of chapels, and the circumstances under which they may be erected, and in regard to the position of the clergy attached to them. And the principles which should obtain in formulating such legislation should be the allowance of the greatest possible freedom for their erection consistent with the absolutely necessary protection of the rights of parish churches, the recognition of the general law as to the right of patrons in regard to the appointment to their cure, and the recognition of the spiritual position and rights belonging to clergy having cure of souls, in those entrusted with their charge, whatever may be the title assigned them.

EDITORIAL DEPARTMENT.

With this number the connection of the writer with this REVIEW, as Proprietor and Editor, ceases. For six years he has had it in charge; it has been to him a labor of love, a labor it is hoped not altogether useless to the Church. It is given up now not because of lack of interest, or from a sense of failure, but because it is found impossible to do justice both to the REVIEW and to a growing parish. The two are a burthen one man is unable to bear, each demands the devotion of his whole time. And feeling that one must be given up, it is thought that duty requires the Parish work should be retained.

In reflecting on the course which has been followed in conducting the REVIEW we are convinced that on the whole it has been a right one. The effort has been to present to the reader the

various phases of opinion in the church. The Editor has not attempted to enforce his own private opinions alone, but, so far as he could, to show what others thought. He has indeed been accused of advocating in his editorials a restrictive policy *i. e.*, of urging on the General Convention, the passing of laws regulating clerical dress, church ornaments, etc. But he has never prescribed what those laws ought to be; he has simply argued that in justice to the clergy, the church ought to legislate on such subjects, giving certain limits beyond which, whether in excess or deficit no one should be allowed to go. But he disclaims any feeling, and denies that he has written a word, against real church progress or advance. Against a certain pretended advance he has indeed argued; for that is not a reality but a name. There is a story of an officer who desiring to fall back before the enemy, to preserve appearances with his men, gave the command, "advance by a retrograde motion." We think some of the pretended advance in churchmanship partakes of this "retrograde" character; and against such we have protested. And we have advocated the same view set forth in the recent Pastoral of our Bishops, to do all that can be done consistently, to make this the Catholic Church for the American people, and not to attempt to force upon them the customs and beliefs of mediæval times.

The AMERICAN CHURCH REVIEW was established in 1848, and has become a part of the history of the church. Nearly every important measure of real advance, which has prevailed, has found strong advocacy in its pages. A list of those who have written for it, contains the most illustrious names of our clergy and laity. It is the only publication of its kind in the church; and deserves a far better support than it has received.

In handing over the REVIEW to our successor we have reason to believe that it will be conducted on the same general principles as heretofore, and we bespeak for it a liberal support. The Editor is so situated that he is able to devote his whole time to the work, and the list of contributors for the coming year shows that a variety of subjects, from various standpoints, will be presented to the readers. We believe that in the hands of the Rev. H. M. Baum the REVIEW will maintain its high standard, and continue its good work for the church.

In retiring from the editorship we desire to express our hearty

thanks to those many friends who have so kindly aided us by their voluntary contributions of articles. We part from them with regret, and shall miss their pleasant correspondence. May God's blessing rest upon them, and upon all who labor for His Church.

One final word on business. There is a great deal of money due us for subscriptions;—*which money we need, and must have.* Bills have been sent to all who are in arrears, and they are earnestly requested to make prompt payment. It seems strange that persons who are honest enough in ordinary business matters, in paying their butchers, bakers, tailors, etc., should be so careless in regard to subscriptions to church periodicals. This is a debt fairly due, the comparative smallness of the amount does not make it less dishonest to withhold payment. We are taught in the catechism to keep our hands from "picking" as well as from "stealing;" and "to be true and just in *all* our dealings." We shall expect that all who know themselves to be in our debt, will at once, send the amount due, or give some valid excuse for not so doing.

We do not propose to give any account of the proceedings of the late General Convention. An article on that subject by a far more competent hand, will appear in the January number of this REVIEW. But there is one of its acts, in some respects the most important of any that for many years has been passed, which for convenience of reference, and because it has been misunderstood, we shall here record. For several years there has been a wish expressed for more freedom in the use of the Prayer Book. This found expression first in the "Memorial Papers," presented to the House of Bishops by the late Dr. Muhlenberg in 1853. Since that time there has been constant agitation of the subject, but no positive legislation until this year, for resolutions and opinions of the several houses are not legislation. By this Convention something has been actually done. For the first time in several years both Houses have consented to a change in the Prayer book, for that is what it amounts to, though taking the form of an alteration in the "Ratification of the Book of Common Prayer." As this is a very important step, requiring the careful consideration of the church, we think it advisable to reprint it in full.

The Joint Committees on Constitutional Amendments, on Canons and on the Prayer Book, to whom was referred the Report of the Joint Committee of the two Houses on Shortened Services, respectfully report, that in their opinion, a greater flexibility in the use of the Book of Common Prayer is necessary to the growth and usefulness of the Church, and that in view of the many difficulties and objections which have been made to the different plans heretofore proposed, some of these objections being of the gravest nature, they believe that these contrariant opinions may be completely harmonized and the end so much desired may be effectually reached by amending the Ratification of the Book of Common Prayer as proposed in the following Resolution :

Resolved, The House of Bishops concurring, that the Ratification of the Book of Common Prayer be amended so as to read as follows, and that such proposed amendment be made known to the several Diocesan Conventions, in order that it may be adopted in the next General Convention according to Art. VIII. of the Constitution.

THE RATIFICATION OF THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER.

By the Bishops, the Clergy and the Laity of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America, in General Convention assembled.

The General Convention of this Church, having heretofore, *to wit*: on the 16th day of October, A. D. 1789, set forth and established A Book of Common Prayer and Administration of the Rites and Ceremonies of the Church, and declared it to be the Liturgy of this Church, and required that it be received as such by all the members of the same, and be in use from and after the 1st day of October, A. D., 1790; the same book is hereby ratified and confirmed, and ordered to be the use of this Church from this time forth.

But note, however, that on days other than Sunday, Christmas Day, the Epiphany, Ash Wednesday, Good Friday and the Ascension Day, it shall suffice if the minister begin Morning or Evening Prayer at the General Confession, or the Lord's Prayer preceded by one or more of the sentences appointed at the beginning of Morning and Evening Prayer, and end after the Collect for Grace or the Collect for Aid Against Perils, with 2 Cor., xiii. 14, using so much of the Lessons appointed for the day, and so much of the Psalter as he shall deem to be for edification.

And note also, that on any day when Morning and Evening Prayer shall have been duly said, or are to be said, and upon days other than those first afore mentioned, it shall suffice when need may require, if a Sermon or Lecture be preceded by at least the Lord's Prayer and one or more Collects found in this book [*provided that no prayers not set forth in said book shall be used be-*

fore or after such sermon or lecture, nor any portion of the order for the administration of the Lord's Supper]. And note further also, that on any day the Morning Prayer, the Litany, or the order for the administration of the Lord's Supper, may be used as a separate and independent service, provided that no one of these services shall be disused habitually.

This was the shape the matter eventually took after much consultation between the joint committees of the two Houses. When brought before the Clerical and Lay Deputies, they by a strong vote, resolved to strike out the sentences we have placed between brackets. The House of Bishops agreed to strike out the last part, "nor any portion of the order for the administration of the Lord's Supper," but refused to concur in striking out the first which we have italicised, forbidding the use of any "prayers not set forth in this book, before or after sermons, etc." When the resolution so amended came back to the lower house, a warm debate ensued. It was urged that this would take away a liberty already enjoyed and make the rule stricter than before. The fact is, and we wonder it was not generally noticed, that this Ratification is more restrictive than the present canon. That enacts that *before all sermons, etc.*, this orders that both *before and after sermons*, the prayers of this book shall be used and none other. We do not ourselves care for this liberty, but as some do, we think it a pity that in drawing up the resolution the words of the present canon on this point had not been retained. It must be remembered that this is not yet a law. It must first go to the Diocesan Conventions (for their information, not for their action), and then again before the next General Convention of 1883. If then ratified, it becomes the law of the Church. But it must be adopted or rejected as it is, no amendments are now in order.

AMONG THE BOOKS.

THE PARABLES OF OUR LORD, *Interpreted in view of their Relation to Each Other*, By Henry Calderwood, LL. D., Professor of Moral Philosophy, University of Edinburgh. LONDON AND NEW YORK: MACMILLAN AND CO. 1880. pp. 443. \$2.00.

We consider this a valuable addition to the literature on the Parables. It treats of them in a different way from that so

familiar to us in the works of Trench and others. This is not as are they, a critical commentary on the Sacred Text; nor is it intended solely for the clergy; but for popular use. Hence there is little Latin or Greek on its pages; few, if any, quotations from the Fathers, or other writers; but a plain, clear setting forth of the meaning and lessons of the Parables, as the writer understands them. He has, however, his theory about them; not indeed a new one, but yet one seldom dwelt on as its importance demands. And we think it is the unfolding of this, which gives its special value to the book. We put this in his own words.

The parables of Scripture have been constructed and set in position upon a definite plan, such as may fairly warrant us in seeking here a systematic revelation of Gospel truth, even apart from other portions of Scripture.

If then a plan of arrangement is to be not merely fanciful, but evidently reasonable, it becomes important that we discover some central point of connection—some key to the system.

This *key* our author finds, rightly we believe, in the introductory form so frequently used. "The Kingdom of Heaven is like unto," or "Whereunto shall we liken the Kingdom of God;" which Kingdom is the Spiritual Kingdom of God, in other words His church.

This spiritual kingdom is represented in the parables....They depict different aspects of the kingdom. First, there are those which are concerned with entrance into the kingdom; next, those describing the privileges and the duties of the kingdom; thereafter, those setting forth the relations of the kingdom to this world; and, finally, those which illustrate the relations of the kingdom to the world beyond. All the parables come within these four divisions; and when so placed, we obtain a most impressive view of their unity as a revelation of truth....The order in which the subjects have been set down is the natural order for their consideration.... By this order then I mean to keep.

Accordingly the book has four divisions, under which the Parables are classed, ignoring entirely the order in which they are found in the Gospels.

We believe this theory to be in the main correct; but must leave it to the reader to examine for himself how far the writer has succeeded in proving his points.

MEMOIRS OF THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA. BY THE RIGHT REV. WILLIAM WHITE, D. D. *Edited with Notes and a Sketch of the Origin and Progress of the Colonial Church, By the Rev. B. F. De Costa.* NEW YORK: E. P. DUTTON & COMPANY. 1880. pp. 474. \$4.00.

It would be utterly superfluous to say anything in regard to the value of Bishop White's Memoirs of the American Church. It is simply a book which no one can dispense with who desires to

obtain a knowledge of our church history; no library of any pretensions to completeness can be without it. But the older editions were out of print, scarce, and commanding a very high price for second hand copies. The publishers therefore deserve the thanks of the church for bringing out this handsome edition, and we hope that a large sale will repay their enterprise. As said above, it is unnecessary to speak of Bishop White's *Memoirs* themselves; we therefore here call attention to the Editor's work in this new edition.

Mr. De Costa deserves great praise for what he has not done, as well as for what he has done. To one so well read in church literature, and wielding so ready a pen, the temptation to add voluminous notes must have been very strong; and knowing him as we do, we can perceive and admire the restraint he has evidently placed upon himself. The few notes he has added, are signed "*Ed.*," are explanatory and useful, as for instance that on p. 26, regarding the election as Bishop of Maryland of Dr. William Smith. The principal and important work of the Editor is the preface of 56 pages, on "The Origin and Progress of the Colonial Church"—which he is so competent to write. This forms a valuable addition to our church history, showing the early establishment of the Church of England in the colonies, earlier even than that of the Puritans and Roman Catholics. The first christian service celebrated in New England, he asserts, was at the Island of Monhegan, near the Kennebec, by the Rev. Richard Seymour, a minister of the Church of England, on Sunday, the 9th of August, 1607. We call especial attention to the proofs given of the early establishment of churchmen in New England and Virginia. It is fully time that the pretensions of those who boast so much of the "*Pilgrim Fathers*" should be investigated.

A full Index is added to the book. The paper and typography are all that could be desired. If the publishers could afford to reduce the price a little, there would we believe be a large demand for this valuable and beautiful book.

THE CHURCHMAN'S LIFE OF WESLEY. *By R. Denny Urlin, of the Middle Temple.* LONDON: SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE. NEW YORK: POTT, YOUNG & Co. pp. 352. \$1.50.

This book is well named. It is not a full life of Wesley, though it gives the leading incidents of his career. Its object is to show from his own words the true position of Wesley towards the Church of England. This it does very fully and fairly. We wish all the followers of this great man would read this life, and ponder carefully the lessons it conveys. Most of them would be surprised to find how far they have departed from the teachings of their founder. Wesley always warned his preachers not to

take upon themselves an office for which they had no authority. He drew very clearly the line between the Prophetic and the Priestly offices, and never gave any countenance to, or rather we ought to say, absolutely forbade, their ministering the Sacraments. He also wrote very strongly of the sin of separating from the Church, and to the day of his death declared himself a member of the Church of England, and urged his followers to so continue. The neglect of these colonies by that Church, gave some excuse, though by no means a sufficient one, for the appointment of preachers for America; but Wesley never thought of setting up over here a new church. It would be well if our Methodist brethren would study these points with the aid of the light thrown upon them by the writings of Wesley. Another fact is brought out in this life, not generally known. The Church of England never turned the Methodists out of its fold, Wesley was allowed to preach in Parish Churches up to the very last.

HISTORY OF THE ENGLISH PEOPLE. *By John Richard Green, M. A. Volume IV.* NEW YORK: HARPER & BROTHERS. 1880. pp. 519. \$2.50.

This Fourth Volume completes the history according to the original design. It contains two parts. Book VIII. The Revolution, 1683-1760; and Book IX. Modern England, 1760-1815, ending with the final abdication of Napoleon Buonaparte. It is to be hoped that the author may be able to continue it; for a most interesting part of the history remains unwritten. Many important changes in the political and social condition of the English people have taken place since 1815. It may not be amiss to inform those of our readers who are not familiar with this work, that as its title implies, it is not so much a history of England, as of the people of England. The topics which take up the bulk of most histories, battles and the strifes of Kings, have brief mention. The condition of the people and events political and religious which affected them, are dwelt upon more minutely. It is this which gives such special interest to the work, making it a necessary supplement to other English histories. The whole history deserves a much more careful and lengthy notice than we are now able to give it. We can only call the attention of our readers to the issue of this last volume with its copious Index, and assure them that they will find both pleasure and profit in the perusal of the entire work.

SUNDAY: ITS ORIGIN, HISTORY, AND PRESENT OBLIGATION, *considered in the Bampton Lectures, preached before the University of Oxford in the year 1860, by James Augustus Hessey, D. C. L., Archdeacon of Middlesex.* Fourth Edition, with a copious In-

dex. NEW YORK: POTT, YOUNG & Co. 1880. pp. 436. \$2.00.

That there is a demand for a Fourth Edition of this book is a sufficient proof of its value. It is indeed a standard work on the subject of which it treats. The different views regarding the Sunday are set forth at length, and are shown to resolve themselves into two. One, which holds that all the obligations of the Jewish Sabbath have been transferred to the First or Lord's Day; the other, that the Jewish Sabbath ceased with the abrogation of the Mosaic Law, but that the Apostles, by inspiration, established the First day, as "The Lord's Day," to be the Christian day of rest and worship. These views, for convenience sake, he designates as the "Sabbatarian," and the "Dominical." Under each general head, many minor shades of difference exist, some, for instance, maintaining that the "Lord's Day," is solely an ecclesiastical institution, without any divine authority. Others who hold to the Sabbatarian theory, believing, that our Lord and the Apostles modified the observances of the Sabbath, making them somewhat less strict to the Christian, than they had been for the Jew. Our author holds to the Dominical theory as stated above. He does not believe that the observance of the Sabbath was established from the Creation as a moral law. He thinks its first promulgation was by Moses. Yet, that there is a moral element in it which puts it on the same footing with the other commandments. We must confess that his argument here is not quite so clear as usual. We do not think he has got rid of the difficulty which meets his theory, in the fact of the sanctification of the Sabbath day at the Creation, and the allusion to that as its cause in the Fourth Commandment. It is scarcely satisfactory to argue that, when in Genesis it is said "and God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it," it means that He intended to do so after many centuries had passed. Our own theory as expressed in this REVIEW for Nov., 1879, is, that, as a tribute to Himself, an acknowledgment of His sovereignty, God from the first has claimed a seventh part of our time, and is also pleased to make this for us a day of rest from labor as well as a day of worship. But the exact manner of keeping it has varied, and it has been left to His Church in different ages to establish rules for its observance. Thus the Mosaic Church had its law, the Christian Church has a different one; both agreeing in the main feature that one-seventh of our time is to be God's day for special worship of Himself, and man's day for rest. Our author's theory as to the origin of the 'Lord's day,' is however, that it is just as divine as was the Sabbath, and his views as to its observance, are excellent. A very interesting history is given of the manner of observing the day from early times down to the present, in various christian communions. The notes, which occupy over one hundred and fifty

pages, are very full, and leave little to be desired in the way of quotation or explanation. If ever the misused phrase "exhaustive" should be applied to a treatise, it may be to this, for it leaves very little unsaid about its subject.

DANGERS AND DUTIES. *Talks to Men and Women*, by Dudley Ward Rhodes; *Rector of the Church of Our Saviour, Cincinnati, Ohio*. PHILADELPHIA: J. B. LIPPINCOTT & Co. 1880. pp. 267.

Mr. Rhodes is already favorably known as the author of "Creed and Greed." This volume will add to his reputation as a plain, fearless preacher. He says in the Preface "'shot your guns,' is the most important thing for the pulpit to learn to-day. We need more definite, practical, personal attack upon the evils and dangers of to-day." "We must interest men by preaching to them as sensibly and practically and wisely as men talk to them in business and in politics, as lawyers talk to juries." This is good advice. A prominent lawyer once said to us, referring to a sermon he had been listening to, "What do I care about the customs of the Second or Third Centuries, the manner of their prayers and music, the cut of their garments and style of their church decorations! I am brought in contact through the week with every variety of evil; what I want when I go to church on Sunday, is to learn how to fight the devil of my own time, next week, better than I did the last week, and to get strength to do it." This is our author's idea, and he treats plainly and fearlessly of the Scepticisms of the age, of Amusements, Reading, Girlhood, Motherhood, Spinsters, Fallen Women, etc. Of course, such preaching is liable to abuse, so is every good thing. We must learn to eliminate the evil and retain that which is good.

THE LIFE AND WORK OF WILLIAM AUGUSTUS MUHLBERG.
By Anne Ayres. *Vir Antiqua Fide et Virtute*. NEW YORK:
HARPER & BROTHERS. 1880. pp. 524.

When the history of the American Church is written, a very valuable source of information will be found in the biographies of her clergy. The Journals of Conventions will furnish statistics, not very reliable, but the best that can be obtained. The files of church papers will describe events, to be taken with many grains of allowance for partisan bias; but the knowledge of the secret causes and feelings which underlie events must be chiefly sought in these biographies. Hence the Church owes a debt of gratitude to those who have placed before her the lives of her prominent men.

Not the least interesting or valuable among these is the one before us. An honorable record for a man to leave behind him,

and one worthy of special notice is conveyed in the absence from the title of this book of the letter "s." It is "The Life and Work." We have many biographies headed "Life and Works," meaning thereby writings. But it is by his WORK that Dr. Muhlenberg will be chiefly known in church history. Not but that his hymns will also live and be esteemed a precious legacy, but the Church of the Holy Communion, N. Y., St. Luke's Hospital and St. John Land will be his memorial. By these he will be known to future generations. A remarkable feature of the man was his patience and his ability to execute his theories by enlisting others in the work. The history of the establishment of the Hospital shows this, and also how God will bless faithful efforts in His cause. He took charge of the new Church of the Holy Communion, New York, May, 1846. In visiting among the poor of what was then the outskirts of the city, he was at once struck with the great need of some place for the care of the sick. The only hospitals then in the city of New York were the Broadway Hospital, since removed, having three hundred and fifty beds, mainly for seamen and accident cases, and Bellevue, devoted entirely to paupers. Moved by his large-hearted, christian charity, Dr. Muhlenberg resolved to begin collections for a church hospital.

On St. Luke's Day (Oct. 18th), 1846, he proposed to the congregation that half of the offerings of the day should be laid aside as the beginning of a fund towards the founding of an institution for the relief of the sick poor, under the auspices of religion, and that on each return of the festival of St. Luke the Evangelist and Physician, the object should be kept in view, and the proceeds of the offertory so appropriated.

No previous announcement of his intention was made. The result would have discouraged any other man. We quote again :

Something more than thirty dollars was the result, a sum so small that a brother clergyman assisting him that afternoon asked with something of scorn—"Pray, when do you expect to build your hospital?" "Never, if I do not make a beginning," Dr. Muhlenberg replied. He could wait. He knew what he was doing.

It may be said with truth that this was the beginning of all those church charities which since have been inaugurated in New York. Yet how slow the growth. It was not until 1849, three years after, that the hospital idea took practical shape. Then it grew so fast that instead of as at first proposed, a parochial institution, it became one for the whole Church. It was the cholera visitation which gave new impulse to the design. Collections had been continued each year on St. Luke's Day, but in the autumn of 1849 this day was observed as a special thanksgiving for deliverance from cholera, and the offertory was so considerable in amount as to warrant an effort to give a practical shape to the project. In May, 1850, St. Luke's Hospital was incorporated, and large contributions came in, in sums varying from \$20,000 down, without names attached, so that its erection became assured. It is worth noticing that Dr. Muhlenberg was fifty years old when he com-

menced this work. We must refer the reader to the book itself for details of this most interesting life. In reading it they will also be surprised, as we confess we have been, to find how many things now common in this Church were introduced by Dr. Muhlenberg, such as Christmas trees, boy choirs and choral singing of the Psalter, weekly Communion, sisterhoods, excursions for the poor, etc. But we must stop here. If we have said enough to induce our readers to peruse this life for themselves we have done them good, for they can scarcely read it without being in some degree stirred up to go and do likewise.

CHIEF ANCIENT PHILOSOPHIES—EPICUREANISM. *By William Wallace, M. A.* LONDON: SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE. NEW YORK: POTT, YOUNG & Co. 1880. pp. 270. \$1.00.

ANCIENT PHILOSOPHIES FOR MODERN READERS—STOICISM. *By Rev. W. W. Capes.* LONDON: SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE. NEW YORK: POTT, YOUNG & Co. 1880. pp. 255. \$1.00.

Some knowledge of the ancient schools of thought is essential to the modern student. There were four of these especially noteworthy—the School of Plato, the Academic; the School of Aristotle, the Peripatetic; the School of Zeno, the Stoic; and the School of Epicurus, called from its founder the Epicurean. There were indeed older philosophies than these, but these four are the ones best developed and known, and the teachings of these still influence the world of thought. Epicureanism and Stoicism, though not perhaps their legitimate offspring, yet to a certain extent inherited respectively the schools of Plato and Aristotle, and from B. C. 250 to A. D. 150 appear to have forced the older ones into the background, and to have divided between them the Roman world. They were, therefore, in full force at the time of the first promulgation of Christianity. St Paul encountered their disciples in Athens. They had more or less influence on the early church, just as at a later period had the teachings first of Aristotle and afterwards of Plato. Hence the importance to the student of church history of a knowledge of these systems. But few have time or patience to study them out for themselves from original sources. These two little volumes are therefore useful as giving in a small space all that it is necessary to know about them. It adds to their value that so far as space allows this information is given in the words of their own founders. To those, therefore, who desire at as little cost of time and study as possible to obtain a clear knowledge of these schools of thought we commend these volumes. The society which has published them and the kindred

ones on "Non-Christian Religious Systems," viz.: Confucianism, Buddhism, Hinduism, Islam, etc., deserves our thanks. They are all by competent scholars and at a price within the reach of all.

INTRODUCTION TO LATIN COMPOSITION. *Revised and enlarged, with Introductory Exercises on Elementary Constructions.* By William F. Allen. BOSTON: GINN & HEATH. 1880. pp. 181.

This is intended as an aid in writing Latin. It appears well adapted for the purpose. No language can be learned by mere translation. To obtain a knowledge of the grammar we must write in it. It is often said, "Why should a boy be taught to write Latin? He is not likely ever to do so when a man." True. But he is likely to need habits of patient industry, of accuracy and of thought, as well as of memory and investigation, and these a careful, thorough study of the grammar and construction of the dead languages induces. It is indeed of little use to a boy to hurry through whole pages of Virgil or Cicero by help of a crib. It is the careless way in which these languages have been taught which has brought their study into disrepute. Such books as this show that a wiser system is prevailing among us.

THE PIONEER CHURCH; or the Story of a New Parish in the West. By the Rev. M. Schuyler, D. D. Second Edition. NEW YORK: POTT, YOUNG & Co. pp. 211. \$1.

We bespeak for this little book a large sale; not only because it is a good book in itself, but because all the proceeds of this edition go to the cause of "Domestic Missions." We incline to think that the well known author has given us some of his own experiences in the West. Everything is drawn *couleur de rose*, and probably no such village as "Arlington" ever did exist, with such a teachable, liberal set of men. But this story shows what can be done in church work by persevering effort. And one lesson of vast importance is set plainly forth: the importance of pre-occupying the ground for the church, instead of coming in, as we too often do, as one among a number of denominations, all started before us.

THOUGHTS FOR WORKING DAYS. *Original and Selected.* By Emily C. Orr. NEW YORK: POTT, YOUNG & Co. pp. 224. 80 cents.

Short passages from Holy Scripture, extracts from well known writers and hymns; arranged for each day of the month for the use of those who have little time to read or pray. An excellent manual, put forth by the London Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, to which we are indebted for so many good books.

AUSTRALIA'S HEROES. By Charles H. Eden. LONDON: SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE. NEW YORK: POTT, YOUNG & Co. pp. 312.

We know from experience that it is not easy to find a connected account of the discoveries in Australia. There is no part of the world, unless it be some portions of Africa, of which so little is known as the interior of the Fifth Continent. This book gives a full account of the various journeys into the interior as late as 1873. There is a large and well printed map. Those who desire to know something about Australian discoveries, without having the time to read large and numerous volumes, will find this a useful and interesting book.

THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL: *External Evidences.* By Ezra Abbot, D. D., LL. D. BOSTON: GEORGE H. ELLIS. 1880. pp. 104. 75c.

This was originally read as an essay before the "Ministers' Institute" by the "Bussey Professor of New Testament Criticism and Interpretation in the Divinity School of Harvard University," and revised and enlarged for printing. It does not pretend to go over the whole ground of the evidence for the genuineness of this Gospel, but is principally taken up with examining the point whether the Fourth Gospel was that quoted by Justin Martyr and by the Gnostic heretics of the second century. This is thoroughly investigated and the objections carefully and impartially examined. The conclusion arrived at is, that there can be no doubt of the genuineness of the Gospel according to St. John. The clergy will find this monogram very interesting and instructive. The source whence it comes adds to its value.

WHAT IS OF FAITH AS TO EVERLASTING PUNISHMENT? *In reply to Dr. Farrar's Challenge in his "Eternal Hope," 1879, by the Rev. E. B. Pusey, D. D.* Second Edition. LONDON, RIVINGTONS. NEW YORK: POTT, YOUNG & Co. 1880. \$1.25.

We wish every one whose mind has been disturbed by the writings of Farrar and others on this question of Eternal Punishment would read this book. Dr. Pusey shows clearly that Farrar is laboring under a misconception of the teaching of the Church, and that it is Calvinism not the Catholic Faith against which he is contending. One very remarkable and unusual feature in the writings of Dr. Pusey is the combination of immense learning with great clearness of style. On pages 22 and 23, there is a summing up, which we think is perfectly satisfactory, as showing what is of the Faith in this matter. We can find room for these only of the twelve paragraphs:

The merits of Jesus reach to every soul who wills to be saved, whether in this life they knew Him, or knew Him not.

God the Holy Ghost visits every soul which God has created, and each soul will be judged as it responded or did not respond to the degree of light which He bestowed upon it, not by our maxims, but by the wisdom and love of Almighty God.

None will be lost, whom God can save, without destroying in them His own gift of free will.

With regard to the nature of the sufferings, nothing is matter of faith.

Dr. Pusey finds a solution for the difficulty of believing that a soul converted at the moment of death, can be fit, without further preparation, for the vision of God, in the doctrine of an Intermediate State, during which by suffering "as by fire," he shall be fitted for heaven (He refers to I. Cor. iii). Farrar believes in such a condition, but thinks it one of further probation. Dr. Pusey shows that there is no teaching in the Bible or in the early Fathers of a future probation; that only they who are saved, are admitted into this state; and that they may be helped by our prayers. We fail to see any difference between this and the Romish doctrine of Purgatory. We cannot but think that where Scripture has been silent, it is wiser for us to be very cautious in expressing opinions—our Lord's Parables seem to teach a free forgiveness and a full reception by our Father.

A great part of the book is taken up with quotations from Jewish writers and Christian Fathers, to show that they held to the belief of everlasting (not remedial) punishment, and that Dr. Farrar is mistaken in his rendering of the word "aionios."

CONCIONES AD CLERUM. 1879-1880. By A. N. Littlejohn, D. D., Bishop of Long Island. NEW YORK: THOMAS WHITTAKER. 1881. pp. 339. \$1.50.

During Lent, 1879 and 1880, Bishop Littlejohn called his clergy together for conference on "the duties and the labors of the Ministry." At the request of those who heard them he has published these addresses, with the addition of a few notes and Appendices. And they are well worth publishing. The whole subject is treated under these heads. I., Clergy and People. II., The Cure of Souls. III., The Grace of Ordination; how to Quicken and Develop It. The Appendices are three. A. On the Casuistry of the Church of Rome. B. On Confession. C. On the Interpretation of Scripture. The second head "The Cure of Souls," is treated at great length, as its importance demands; and especial attention is paid to dealing with individual cases. The Clergy will find much profit from the careful reading of these addresses.

THE ENGLISHMAN'S BRIEF ON BEHALF OF HIS NATIONAL CHURCH. LONDON: SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE. NEW YORK: POTT, YOUNG & Co. 1880. pp. 211. 75c.

We do not know any book which in so small space and at so low a price gives so much information about what we may call the frame-work of the English Church. It is indeed of more interest to Englishmen than to us; for it is intended as an apology for the union of Church and State. But it gives a fair account of the origin of tythes; of the manner of appointing Church officers, from Archbishop down; it shows the immense work among the people the National Church is doing and capable of doing; and it exposes a great many fallacies and false statements as to the position of that Church. In the Appendices is much useful information, not easily attainable, as, on the Income of the Church of England; Litigation among non-conformists; Number of Dissenting Chapels and places of Worship; And the proposal of the Liberation Society in its scheme for disestablishment.

CHRISTMAS BOOKS.

Christmas time is very near and gifts for children are in order. To meet this demand we have before us several books, good, beautiful, and very interesting, to which we beg leave to call the attention of parents and friends of boys and girls. And we can assure them that if, before giving them away, they will themselves read these, they will find them attractive to "children of larger growth." We have not space to give a full notice of each one, but will put them together as received from the publishers.

From Messrs. Pott, Young & Co., 7 Cooper Union, we have a number of the publications of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. This Society, as our readers must have noticed, publishes a great variety of books, so as to suit various classes and ages of readers. We have already noticed in this number some that they have issued. There has been of late a great improvement in their books for children. These now present a substitute for that pernicious sensational literature which does so much harm, for while they are as attractive to the young, they also inculcate indirectly, and therefore pleasantly, religious principles. Those seeking additions to their Sunday-school Libraries ought to purchase these books.

First we will mention "THE CHRONICLES OF ÆSCENDUNE, *By the Rev. A. D. Crane, B. A., of which there are three, viz:*

EDWY THE FAIR. *A Tale of the Days of Saint Dunstan.*
pp. 245. \$1.00.

ALFGAR THE DANE, *A Tale of the Days of Edmund Ironside.* pp. 242. \$1.00.

THE ANDREDS-WEALD, *A Tale of the Norman Conquest.* pp. 448. \$1.50.

The titles of these books, sufficiently explain their subjects. But though to a certain extent historical, reliably so, the author has in each interwoven a tale which carries us back to those olden times and makes us understand better their religious and national feelings, and withal he has managed to make them very interesting; so that once taken up we have found it difficult to lay them down until finished. The last one is exceedingly interesting.

RIVERS OF ICE, *A Tale illustrative of Alpine Adventure and Glacier Action,* By R. M. Ballantyne, with illustrations. pp. 430.

HAIR-BREADTH ESCAPES; or, *The Adventures of Three Boys in South Africa,* By the Rev. H. C. Adams. M. A. With eight Illustrations. pp. 371.

Here are two books, full enough of healthy excitement to please any boy, yet also instructive.

NORTH WIND AND SUNSHINE. MY LONELY LIASSIE. *Both by Annette Lyster.*

The first tells the trials of an orphan who goes out as governess; the second shows the difference between a true and a mistaken religious system.

JOHN HOLBROOK'S LESSONS, *the story of a Choir Boy*; TWO CAMPAIGNS, *A Tale of Old Alsace,* are both good and interesting, though very different. The latter is of the time of Napoleon.

From THOMAS WHITTAKER, BIBLE HOUSE, NEW YORK, we have received the three STANTON CORBET CHRONICLES, by Lucy Ellen Guernsey, viz:

LADY BETTY'S GOVERNESS. pp. 369. \$1.50.

LADY ROSAMOND'S BOOK. pp. 344. \$1.50

THE CHEVALIER'S DAUGHTER. pp. 473. \$1.50.

A continued series illustrative of the times of the Reformation in England and France. All of them instructive and interesting in the highest degree. It may please the reader to know that these volumes are by an American lady.

